INDIA.

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART, B.A.

FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. IV., No. 12. (NEW SERIES.) DECEMBER 1, 1893. SUBSCRIPTION, POST PAID, Six Shillings per ann.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
INDIANA: Paragraphs on Indian Topics, by "Fidus"	333
The Indian National Congress	359
Mr. Justice Ranade	360
India in Parliament	360
Interview with a Bombay Manufacturer	362
OUR LONDON LETTER	363
Edinburgh Indian Association: Speech by Mr. Herbert Paul, M.P.	365
Abolitionists in Conference	366
CORRESPONDENCE: Mr. Justice Mahmuds Successor	367
NOTICE	368
HOW TO POPULARISE THE INDIAN QUESTION, by Mr. Michael Davitt	369
INDIAN STUDENTS IN ENGLAND, by Sir W. Markby, K.C.I.E.	372
THE BEHAR CADASTRAL SURVEY, by Sir Roper Lethbridge, K.C.I.E.	373
SEPARATION OF JUDICIAL AND EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS IN THE BARODA STATE, by K. V. Sarangpani, B.A., L.L.B.	376
The Indian Census	378
"India, Past and Present"	379
The New Viceroy	379
REVIEWS: Lord Auckland	380
The French in India	381
The Portuguese in India	382
The Case of Mr. M. M. Murzban	384
Lord Kimberley on Indian Affairs	384
BIBLIOGRAPHY of Books and Articles on Indian Subjects	384

Indiana.

On the night of November 17th, just before the Overland Mail train left Charing Cross station, some fifty Indians (most of them students) assembled on the platform to wish Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji goodbye. He was starting for the Punjab in order to preside at the meetings of the Indian National Congress. Owing to his recent bereavement—which has at any rate shown Mr. Naoroji how many friends he has to sympathise with his distress—the more public celebrations which had been arranged to commemorate his departure were abandoned. But on the eve of the eventful day which saw our first Indian M.P. returning to his own country with assurances of success and exhortations to further effort the Indian Parliamentary Committee, itself a significant indication of the revived prominence of Indian affairs in the House of Commons, entertained him privately to dinner, and started him on his way amid cordial expressions of goodwill.

The dinner was a great success, and the hearty manifestations of sympathy and congratulation which came from all sides must have been highly gratifying to Mr. Naoroji. In proposing Mr. Naoroji's health, Sir W. Wedderburn, in a happy little speech, accurately represented the sentiments of all who were present. Mr. Naoroji had, he said, in his successful Parliamentary contest, shown the pluck and independence of native Indians. Since his election he had made himself conspicuous in the House of Commons for single-minded devotion to duty. After referring to the Parliamentary successes achieved by the friends of India during the year, Sir W. Wedderburn proceeded to add that, if Mr. Naoroji was leaving behind him in England feelings of general admiration and esteem, he was no less certainly on his way to a splendid reception in India. "And," Sir W. Wedderburn aptly remarked, "the enthusiasm with which Mr. Naoroji is received will be the measure of the Indian people's attachment to British rule, for the agitation which he represents is strictly constitutional, and seeks to make British rule permanent by making it sympathetic and just."

I was pleased to notice, by the way, that the three guests at the dinner to which the Indian Parliamentary Committee entertained Mr. Naoroji on the eve of his departure were Mr. John Burns, M.P., Mr. William Digby, C.I.E., and Mr. J. N. Tata of Bombay.

I referred in October to the signal Parliamentary victory achieved by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji when, to the surprise and confusion of Sir Richard Temple, he prevailed upon the Under Secretary of State for India so to amend the Madras and Bombay Armies Bill as to exclude the Commanders of the armies from the Councils of the Presidencies. The Bill came on for consideration in this amended form in the House of Lords on November 17th, and Lord Kimberley, in course of a speech in support of the amendment, remarked that "it should be made perfectly evident to all that there was a strong

expression of opinion on the subject in the other House"—an expression of opinion, I may mention, which came from the Indian Parliamentary Committee by way of the division-lobby. Accordingly, Lord Kimberley urged the House of Lords to accept Mr. Naoroji's amendment, especially as the Government of India had now come to the same opinion. Lord Cross was absent from the House and Lord Salisbury, although reluctant, had the good sense to refrain from opposition. Mr. Naoroji's amendment was therefore agreed to, the Bill was passed, and another feather was placed in the cap of the Indian Parliamentary Committee. The moral of the incident is that the friends of India in the House of Commons should never miss an opportunity of showing their strength in a division. Where they have been able to take this course their efforts have hitherto been remarkably successful.

As I remarked in a recent number of India, it is necessary to "read between the lines" of questions that are asked in the House of Commons. Such questions have to be framed in terms which will satisfy the rules of Parliamentary procedure—which only allows questions of fact, and not inquiries as to opinions—and run the gauntlet of the severe editing of the clerks at the Table. It happens therefore that the most innocent-looking question may be based upon facts of the most serious import, and the contrast between what is said and what is of necessity left unsaid is sometimes almost ludicrous. A question which was put on November 13th by Sir W. Wedderburn lends itself admirably to this process of

"READING BETWEEN THE LINES."

The Question.	The Facts.
Sir William Wedderburn asked the Under Secretary of State for India whether the attention of the Secretary of State for India had been drawn to a circular dated 15th September last, issued by the Government of the North-West Provinces, urging magistrates to exercise greater stringency in their procedure and punishments, especially in the matter of whipping, and advising that whipping should ordinarily be awarded in cases of theft, unless the offender was an old or weakly man, and that male juvenile offenders should as a rule be punished by whipping, by prolonged detention in a reformatory, or in exceptional cases by a long term of imprisonment: And whether the Secretary of State would direct these instructions to be withdrawn or modified?	(1) The magistrate at Benares censured as "ridiculous" and as "a burlesque of justice" certain sentences passed by the honorary magistrates. (2) This censure was superfluous, as it was in the magistrate's power to move for a revision of the sentences. It was also a grossly improper piece of executive interference with judicial functions. (3) On inquiry it turned out that Mr. Brereton's instructions to the hon. magistrates at Benares were based upon a circular letter from the Government of the North-West Provinces. (4) This circular letter contained the following passage, in addition to the directions set forth in Sir W. Wedderburn's question: "Inability to appreciate the relative heinousness of crime is a most serious fault in a magistrate, and one which, if not remedied, would render the withdrawal of all save third-class powers necessary."

Here, then, is a pretty state of things. The Government of Bengal recently issued a circular calling attention to "the inconvenience and impropriety" of public reflections by executive officers upon judicial decisions. This circular was most necessary and equitable, but it will not suit the sturdy palate of the Government of the North West Provinces. The Government of the North West Provinces is all on the side of interference and stringency, and would encourage whipping and prolonged detention in reformatories and long terms of imprisonment. The facts speak for themselves, and constitute an eloquent plea in favour of that separation of judicial and executive functions of which Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt has written so ably in the columns of India.

I am happy to see that in reply to Sir W. Wedderburn Mr. George Russell administered the snub direct to the Government of the North West Provinces. The Secretary of State, he said, "is unable to pronounce an opinion" in the absence of "any explanation from the Local Government or the Government of India"—so that the circular is admitted to be a document which requires explanation. Moreover, as Mr. Russell stated, the Secretary of State "has telegraphed to India, and will be prepared to state the result in due course." So far as the reformatories are concerned, I heard a story the other day from a gentleman who has spent many years in India. He and some friends, inspecting an Indian reformatory, were informed by the superintendent that their pockets had been picked without their knowledge. The complacent official took such pride in the skill of his young thieves that he had positively incited them to display it upon his visitors! The Government of the North West Provinces encourages whipping in order to save the cost of imprisonment, and it should be remembered that the circular has really the force of an instruction. It is like the orders sent out to resident magistrates in Ireland under a Coercionist Ministry. There is no compulsion to obey, but the magistrate pays the penalty if he fails to obey. In India any such ill-advised independence is rewarded by steady refusal of promotion, and the highly enjoyable experience of hot and unhealthy stations. It goes without saying that the practice of whipping even as a special kind of punishment is directly contrary to the trend of opinion in England. But then, it may be replied, to say that something is abandoned and reprobated

in England is but to recommend it to a certain class of persons in India.

I should like to direct special attention to an article, which will be found on another page, upon the separation of Judicial and Executive functions in the Baroda State. I recommend officials in India to pay attention to what is being done in States like Baroda and Mysore. They will then have an object-lesson in reforms of the kind which the Indian National Congress supports, and will perceive the unwisdom of forcing upon these States the stunting effects of our centralized departmental system.

At the recent Guildhall banquet Lord Kimberley responded to the toast of "Her Majesty's Ministers." The banquet, it is to be feared, has fallen upon evil days, and one no longer expects it to excite important declarations of policy. But Lord Kimberley was able to announce that according to the most recent intelligence which he had received Sir Mortimer Durand's mission to the Amir had met with "conspicuous success." In regard to our relations with Russia his words were equally reassuring. "I believe," he said, "that the friendly negociations which are going on will result in a satisfactory and permanent settlement of our disputes." Referring to Lord Lansdowne, Lord Kimberley said that he deserved "great credit for the manner in which he had introduced the most important change which has been made of late in India—the introduction of some kind of representative element into the Indian Councils." As for the religious riots, Lord Kimberley declared that "the Government of the Empress of India is absolutely impartial. We have but one desire—to maintain order and peace without any favour to any denomination or religion in that country."

Lord Roberts has been to Edinburgh, and Edinburgh has fallen upon the neck of Lord Roberts. This is very right and proper, but the distinguished General hardly, I think, repaid the enthusiasm of bonnie Scotland with the string of platitudes which he delivered at the Synod Hall on November 17th. There were, however, two points in his address on "India, Past and Present," which are worth remarking. Lord Roberts observed that since the Mutiny the number of native troops in India had decreased by over a third, while the number of British troops had been doubled. Moreover, he trusted that the British nation would perceive "how vitally its own prosperity was bound up with the maintenance of our supremacy in India and the extension of our trade with the East." These two remarks, taken together, emphasise the question which was raised in the recent debate on the Indian Budget in the House of Commons—the question, namely, whether India's welfare is the sole end of British government in India, and, if not, whether it is just to charge India with the whole cost, civil and military, in India and in London? Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji based a considerable part of his forcible speech upon the unfairness of persistently making India pay the piper while the Imperial Government calls the tune, and it is to be expected that he will touch upon this all-important topic at the forthcoming meetings of the Congress. India wants a little "reciprocity" in defraying the cost of what Lord Roberts declares to be vital to the prosperity of Great Britain.

Upon another topic Lord Roberts had not the heart to speak. Nor, indeed, was it quite within the scope of the Royal Scottish Geographical Society to listen to an address on, let us say, "The Advantages and Disadvantages of Bureaucracy, with special reference to the Indian Cantonments." Yet this was a subject upon which Lord Roberts might have spoken with special authority. He has dropped the question like a hot potato, but others have taken it up. The report of the Departmental Committee has been followed by two important meetings in Westminster Town Hall, and the death-blow has been dealt at the system which, without the knowledge of the best of Generals, was allowed to flourish in the Indian Cantonments. Want of space prevents anything in the nature of a full report of the conferences of abolitionists, but on another page will be found an extract from an interesting descriptive account published in the *Woman's Herald*. I understand that at the first opportunity the attention of Parliament will be invited to the subject, and steps will be taken to make penal any transgression of the resolution of the House of Commons. From the purely political point of view, one significant fact which Mr. Russell's Committee brought to public notice was that, under the Government of India, rank abuses can flourish unobserved by the authorities. Sir W. Wedderburn happily compares the system with the condition of the bulky antediluvian monster that could not tell what was going on at the other end of him.

The Blue-book containing the report on sanitary measures in India in 1891-2 has just been issued. The opponents of state-regulation of vice will be interested to hear that, according to this official summary, "the chief causes of sickness in the whole European Army were, as in the previous year, venereal disease and ague, the former yielding a ratio of 401 per 1,000 against 504 in 1890, and the

latter 343 per 1,000 against 354. "More than half (54 per cent.) of the total sickness resulted," says the Blue-book, "from these two causes." This evidence will add weight to the already overwhelming conclusiveness of Mr. George Russell's Committee. As to the native army the Blue-book states that the chief cause of sickness was ague, which yielded 44 per cent. of the total admissions to hospital. Has the Government ascertained the cause of the wider prevalence of a certain kind of disease in the European army? There was, we are told, a marked improvement in the health of the Bombay native army in 1891. Of an average strength of 23,780 the admissions to hospital were in the ratio of 978 against 1,139 in 1890, the daily sick-rate was 31 or 4 per thousand less, and the death-rate 9·63 against 10·99. Turning to the statistics of general population, one finds that in all provinces except Bengal, Assam, and Coorg the birth-rate exceeded the death-rate. The year was more unhealthy than 1890, and the registered deaths rose from 5,848,122 to 5,885,539, but owing to the ratios of mortality of nearly all the provinces being calculated on the census population of 1891, the average death-rate declined from 30·14 to 28·42.

The Rectorial Election at Edinburgh, which I am sorry to say resulted in the defeat of Lord Reay, brought to light the sort of temper against which India has to contend in the semi-educated classes of Great Britain. I have before me a report of a meeting held to promote the candidature of Lord Reay's opponent. The chairman of the meeting, a gentleman of the name of Smith, acquitted himself in a fashion which must have proved a little embarrassing to his friends. I need not refer to the esteem in which Lord Reay is held in India as well as in the United Kingdom. Mr. Smith distributed his abuse with commendable impartiality between Lord Reay and the Indian National Congress. This was the kind of thing:

> "Lord Reay was 31-32ds Dutch. He dared say many of them knew that there was in India an annual meeting which designated itself the Indian National Congress, and which professed and desired to be representative of India. He might say the Indian National Congress was nothing of the kind. That Congress, which was chiefly, or at all events largely composed of the writer class—the class which they called Baboos, and of the other persons who were what might be called the educated proletariats of India—that Congress was not as a rule taken any notice of by the Governors whom the Queen sent out to India. Lord Reay departed from those traditions, and patted the Indian National Congress on the back."

And so forth and so on. I wish the "gentlemanly party" joy of Mr. Smith.

A deputation from the East India Association waited upon Lord Elgin on November 17th to offer their congratulations on his appointment to the office of the Viceroy and Governor-General of India, and to present to him a memorial dealing with some Indian questions. The memorial (which came, if I mistake not, from the versatile pen of Sir Roper Lethbridge) seems to have displayed an advance in Liberalism on the part of the East India Association. It called attention, for example, to the increasing pressure of expenditure on civil and military administration and invited the new Viceroy's "vigilant attention" to the subject. It spoke favourably of extended employment of Indians in public capacities in India, and of means of improving the economic condition of the Indian cultivator. It submitted that recent changes in the constitution of the Legislative Councils justified the belief that those Councils—now to some extent representative of the people of India—would enable the Government of India to arrive at just conclusions suited to the peculiar conditions of the country. Lord Elgin, in reply, promised to give careful consideration to these and other matters brought before him, and remarked how advantageous it was that "there should be a body, including members of all political parties, who could set aside those divisions which naturally divided men in this country and devote themselves to the welfare of the people of India."

By the way, I understand that it is proposed that a deputation of the Indian Parliamentary Committee should wait upon Lord Elgin before he leaves for India, with the view of enlisting his sympathies on the side of just native claims. The meeting is, I believe, in course of arrangement, and I hope to give some account of it in India for January.

Mr. J. N. Tata, the well-known mill-owner in Bombay, has stated in an interview with a representative of India his opinion of the recent decree of Council by which the value of the rupee was arbitrarily raised by something like twelve per cent. Everybody knows that this statesman-like act has placed a fresh burden upon the poverty-stricken peasantry of India, and has caused widespread commercial embarrassment. But these things are of small moment to the serene dignitaries of Simla. What may penetrate their callousness is the more formidable discovery that their device for "putting off the evil day" is odious even to the capitalists who, if anybody, might have been expected to regard it with favour. Mr. Tata makes it clear, as will be seen from the interesting conversation which is narrated on another page, that the expedient adopted by the Government of India strikes a dangerous blow at the cultivating class, and cannot therefore be approved by anybody who wishes to see India prosperous. A protest coming from so strong a body as that for which Mr. Tata speaks

cannot be lightly dismissed even by Indian officials, and it is much to be hoped that they will realise without further loss of time that, as Mr. Tata puts it, the "intelligent and educated classes" of India "are losing faith in the capacity of their rulers." I understand that suitable steps are being taken to spread broadcast throughout the United Kingdom the views which non-official residents in India really entertain of the silver question.

Meantime, some English newspapers have published a copy of the Memorial, addressed by the Indian Association in Calcutta to the Government of India, with regard to the payment of compensation to the "non-domiciled" European and Eurasian servants of the Indian Government for alleged losses through the fall in the gold value of the rupee. This particular device seems to have been singularly unfortunate, for it has roused the indignation of the natives without by any means satisfying the officials. Many of the latter are not less but more discontented—on account, partly, of the arbitrary way in which the new arrangement has been applied, partly of the new demand for income-tax to which it has in some cases given rise. The natives, with better reason, complain that at a time when internal reforms, sanitary improvements, railway extensions, and reductions of taxation are being postponed through lack of funds, it is grotesque to swell the salaries of officials by what is really a permanent advance of some six millions of rupees annually. The Memorial of the Indian Association expresses an opinion similar to the opinion which was expressed in these columns some time ago. If the Government thinks that its servants have made a bad bargain let it pay gratuities to individuals. It has no excuse for making a general arrangement which amounts to increasing salaries all round. Moreover it should be remembered that, if officials have endured losses, others have endured losses as well, and that it is hardly a generous course to pay themselves compensation out of the pockets of more needy fellow-sufferers.

I may add two further observations upon this matter. Payment of compensation for loss by exchange should certainly not have been extended as a permanent arrangement to apply to officials appointed in the future. Rather, the demand for compensation was itself a strong argument for the further employment of educated natives. Again, if indeed any compensation was to be paid by one fellow-sufferer to another, the payment should not only have been in the nature of a gratuity, but also of a gratuity graduated in each case according to the exchange-value of the rupee at the time when the individual officials entered the Service. It is, for example, neither equitable nor reasonable that the official who entered the Service when the exchange-value of the rupee was one shilling and sixpence should receive the same amount of "compensation" with the official who entered when the exchange-value was one shilling and tenpence.

Among recent "calls to the Bar" I notice the names, at the Inner Temple, of Mr. Ahmed Rahimtula Sayani, Mr. Shaporji Aspaniarji Kapadia, M.D., L.R.C.P., Mr. Abdula Rahimtula Sayani, and Mr. Abus Sabah Muhammad Ziaur Rahman; at Lincoln's Inn, of Mr. Thakoor Bhawance Singh Raghabansi; at the Middle Temple of Mr. Vishna Singh Kapur and Mr. Synd Muhammad Bilgranii; and at Gray's Inn of Mr. Shambu Nath Barry, of Punjab University.

Lord Lansdowne delivered at Agra, on November 10th, a speech which the correspondent of the *Times* described as "the most important that has been delivered in India of late years on the cow-protection agitation." It is a pity that the *Times* should misrepresent the Viceroy in this way. Lord Lansdowne's speech discussed the recent religious riots, and in attributing them bluntly to "cow-protection agitation" the *Times* is guilty of a partial and hasty judgment of which Lord Lansdowne was innocent. The Viceroy, indeed, expressly stated that "he would not attempt to distribute the blame among those concerned. The Muhammadans had been sometimes at fault, and the Hindus at others." Several passages in the speech exemplified and encouraged the same wise attitude of judicial impartiality. "Our policy is," said the Viceroy, "one of strict neutrality and toleration, but that toleration does not extend to disorder and crime, and, whoever is at the head of affairs in India, depend upon it, disorder and crime will be put down with a strong and fearless hand." Again, "we are bound to secure to both the great religious denominations freedom from molestation or persecution in the exercise of their religious observances," and "we shall protect the religions of both sides alike, and we shall punish according to the law any act which wantonly outrages the religious feelings of any section of the community."

All this was unexceptionable. It set forth with admirable fidelity the spirit in which, according to the Queen's Proclamation, the Government of India is bound to deal with differences of race or creed in the Indian community. Lord Lansdowne made no secret of his knowledge that there have been those who professed to see a different spirit at work—the

spirit of "Divide and Rule." "I can find," he said, "no words strong enough to denounce the wickedness of those who have told you that the Government encourages these quarrels in order to sow dissensions between class and class. It is a miserable falsehood, which is not believed by those who circulate it, and which has, I am convinced, found little credence." This assurance would be more satisfactory if we had any confidence that Lord Lansdowne was more fully informed than Lord Roberts was as to the conduct of his subordinates, and that he knew what all the vast hierarchy of officials who are under his authority are doing and thinking. For my own part, judging from the native press and from the letters of multitudinous correspondents, I imagined that what the critics of the Government were saying was not so much that the Government was encouraging quarrels, as that it ought to give stringent instructions to its servants to be absolutely impartial. Then they would give no colour to allegations charging them with pitting class against class.

So far as the attitude of the Viceroy is concerned Lord Lansdowne's speech was, of course, all that it should have been. Nobody in his senses dreamed that it would be anything else. But where religious animosities are chronic and grievous and of long standing, the evil is not met by a promise of impartial forbearance to the innocent and a threat of swift retribution to the guilty. The Government of Bombay may be splendidly impartial, but how far is it in touch with the people? How comes it that, after these many years, officials are taken by surprise by feuds between Hindus and Muhammadans? The Indian National Congress, so long ago as 1888, took special precautions to avoid religious dissensions. What has the Government of India done? How comes it that it has failed? There can be no doubt that the first step towards the prevention of such outbreaks in the future is rigid inquiry by a mixed Commission of officials and non-officials into the causes of the riots. The House of Commons is awaiting the special report ordered by the Secretary of State and, in the meantime, sensible men will suspend judgment. Only Lord Lansdowne might have explained that religious dissensions in India are confined to the ignorant and uneducated class. There is no friction between the better classes of Hindus and Mussulmans.

During the past month an enquiring public has been favoured with almost daily bulletins of the health of Sir M. Durand's Mission, and descriptions, not to say glorifications, of the hospitality of the Afghans. The maxim about fearing the Greeks even though they "bear" gifts seems to have been thrown to the winds, and, so far as outsiders can judge, they have been having in Afghanistan a smoking concert long drawn out. The festivities have, doubtless, been most enjoyable, and it would perhaps be ungrateful in the mere taxpayer to ask what it all means. It would also be useless, for no information is to be volunteered until everything is settled. Then the uninteresting person aforesaid will be permitted to satisfy himself with Hobson's choice. It is a pretty scheme, and, thanks to the kindness of the Secretary of State for India, has been pleasantly carried out. But what is this we hear about the increase of the Amir's subsidy from 12 to 18 lakhs annually, and the removal of all restrictions upon the import of arms and stores into Afghanistan? Can it be that the taxpayer is to be kept in the dark as to everything but the bill?

On the face of it it would certainly seem that the Amir had made the best of the bargain. The increase of his subsidy by fifty per cent. may be a trifle in the eyes of permanent officials, but it is a serious matter for those who have to defray the expense. What makes the burden still more annoying is the fact that it will have to be borne as the result of secret negociations. The public, whether in India or in England, cannot protest too often or too strongly against transactions carried on in its name in the inscrutable way which has been exemplified by Sir M. Durand's Mission. What is the object of concealment? Is there discreditable work in progress which it would be unpleasant to disclose? Or is the Government bent upon an over-reaching policy, the success of which would be prejudiced by publicity? In either case the general body of the public is being kept in the dark because such schemes are being executed in private as would be condemned if they were made known. As Jeffreys said on a celebrated occasion, "it will not do."

A lurid light is thrown upon the administration of justice in the Punjab by a case to which the *Tribune* recently gave prominence. A case between one Iamal Din Khau, of Jullundur cantonment, and three hide-merchants of the same place was filed in the court of the cantonment magistrate, Colonel Gouldsbury. Whereupon the gallant colonel sent to Colonel Roberts, Deputy Commissioner, the following letter:

"My Dear Roberts,—In forwarding the accompanying two cases I have been particularly requested by Colonel Pennington to ask you to try the case yourself or to send to an European magistrate. As you will be busy packing, etc., prior to going home, and the case is likely to be a longish one, would you kindly transfer it to Rowe. We are very anxious that a searching inquiry be made, and an exemplary punishment be given.

Colonel Pennington and I have both been vilified by these men, who are the cats-paws of some big men in the Sadr anti-agitators.

"Yours sincerely,
"(Sd.) D. GOULDSBURY.
"Cantonment Magistrate.

"Jullundur, 14th March, 1893."

Colonel Gouldsbury, it is to be noted, was not only interested in the case, but was also a witness for the prosecution. The sequel, published in the *Lahore Tribune* of October 4th, is instructive:

"The cantonment magistrate of Jullundur, we hear from our correspondent in that place, has expelled from—what we should call—his territory two respectable hide-merchants, without letting them know the reason of their expulsion. They are now living, we are told, in the jungles in the vicinity of the cantonment like Sansiahs. They cannot venture into their own homes and see their wives and children. Six months ago they were well-to-do men, having considerable movable and immovable property, and to-day they are practically outlaws, skulking about in the jungles. And this plunge from felicity to misery has been caused by the ukase of a cantonment magistrate. The poor hide-merchants do not remember ever having done anything that could bring even the slightest punishment on them."

What has the Secretary of State to say to this?

That good friend of India, the *Times* correspondent at Calcutta, has been roused to stern indignation by a paragraph which recently appeared in a native paper. So hateful did the paragraph appear to him that he had recourse to the Indo-European telegraph to transmit it in full to create further distress in Printing House Square. On the following day that portion of the British public which reads the *Times* learnt, in the largest type, that Indians are "like toys in the hands of Englishmen," that "an Englishman wilfully shoots down a native as he would a wild beast," and that "it is owing to the defects of English Administration that many tradesmen now adulterate articles of food with impure and noxious things." These statements are not perhaps models of discretion, but they are wisdom itself compared with the judgment with which the sensitive gentleman at Calcutta prefixed them. Such is his sense of humour that he positively permitted himself to describe the offending paragraph as "one of the many unfortunate results of the cow protection movement." It is obvious that the author of this opinion is thrown away in the scissors-and-paste department at Calcutta. He ought without delay to join the leader-writing staff of the *Times*. He might then co-operate more directly with the other discerning gentleman who, in a moment of inspiration, was able to trace the recent religious riots to the demand for simultaneous examinations to the Civil Services.

The Hon. Surendra Nath Banerjea, one of the elected members recently added to the Indian Legislature, is clearly making good use of the right of interpellation. In a recent number of INDIA I referred to the arbitrary way in which some of his questions in the Bengal Council had been disallowed. But he is not to be daunted, and the representatives of officialism in the English press have been compelled to give prominence to his efforts to rouse the Government into life. At the opening of the winter Session he put a considerable number of questions of which the most important was, we are told, whether the Government proposed to organise Committees of Conciliation in districts where religious riots had taken place or were apprehended. The Chief Secretary replied, it appears, that a circular had been issued to local offices inviting them to "consider the possibility of constituting such committees," but "owing to the embittered state of local feelings their efforts had been attended with scant success." Perhaps it would not be in order to ask how much opposition it takes to discourage an official in the performance of his duty. The *Times* adds that "Mr. Banerjea's other questions related for the most part to the increased employment of natives in the public service, and elicited no important information." On this subject we are awaiting with some curiosity the reply of the Government of India to Lord Kimberley's despatch.

I hear that Mr. John Jardine will contribute to the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* for January, an article upon the proposed university for Burma. The university is the natural result of the large School Board over which Mr. Jardine himself presided, it is desired both by the Buddhists and the missionaries, and its institution is regarded by many as the only means of placing the Buddhist monastic system safe above the unfriendly interference of officials. The Educational Board have, I understand, submitted the proposal to the Government of India and it is to be hoped that the officials, little as they care for universities, will have the courage to accept it.

FIDUS.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

WHEN the present issue of INDIA reaches the country from which it takes its name the Indian National Congress will already have begun its ninth Session. They say that nine is a lucky number, and we trust that the omen is of good augury for the first Congress that has been held in the Punjab. The enthusiasm for which the national assembly is the annual signal is likely on many grounds to reach this year even an unwonted height. To begin with, Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, the President of the Congress, is not only one of India's most esteemed leaders but is also a member of the British House of Commons. He has sailed to his native country from the country of his adoption at once as a native

statesman of proved capacity and as a messenger of goodwill from the Imperial Parliament. The combination is something more than picturesque. It is the token of a new era in the history of Indian reform. Nor is it merely fruitful of promise for the future. Mr. Naoroji will be able to lay before his audience a gratifying record of good work done in the House of Commons. The adoption of a resolution in favour of simultaneous examinations to the Civil Services was the climax of years of patient work and, as we show elsewhere, there have been other successes as well. But the reformer's eyes are set towards the future, and Mr. Naoroji will, if we mistake not, formulate in some detail the great programme of work which has only been begun. The awful problem of India's poverty, the need of more equitable financial relations between her taxpayers and the Imperial Government, the demand for more general association of native capacity in the work of government—these questions, and questions like them, will naturally come under review. Mr. Naoroji also goes out to India on an errand of conciliation. The Congress has played a leading part in softening hostilities of race and creed, and the Government of India cannot more effectively demonstrate the sincerity of its desire that religious riots should cease than by holding out the right hand of fellowship to the messenger of peace. Lord Lansdowne and the Lieutenant-Governor cannot fail to perceive that the meeting of the Congress offers an unparalleled opportunity for the spread of counsels of moderation on all sides. We are sanguine as to the results. The Congress will indicate its continued loyalty to the well-defined scheme of constitutional reform with which its name is indissolubly associated, and its session is certain to add to the zeal and self-sacrifice which have animated all its work.

MR. JUSTICE RANADE.

LORD KIMBERLEY and Lord Harris have shown admirable tact in appointing to the judgeship in the High Court of Bombay, rendered vacant by the lamented death of Mr. Justice Telang, a native scholar and lawyer so widely and so deservedly popular in India as the Hon. Mahadev Govind Ranade, C.I.E. It is not enough to say that the appointment is excellent. It has been welcomed both in India and by India's friends in England with something like enthusiasm. Active as Mr. Telang was in so many departments of public life, he always found time to remember that he was a patriot first and a lawyer afterwards. The loss of such an one is irreparable. But nothing else could have gone so far to bridge over the chasm caused by his death as the appointment which the Government has made. Mr. Ranade is so well known that it is unnecessary to remind our readers of his manifold qualities. Whether as a member of the Bombay Legislative Council or as Senior Fellow of Elphinstone College, Professor of English Literature or Advocate of the High Court, Sir Alexander Grant's favourite pupil or the Administrator of the Deccan Agriculturists' Relief Act—in all these and many other capacities Mr. Ranade has consistently shown, during the whole course of an exceptionally brilliant career, the highest qualities of character and intellect. To his splendid gifts he adds an invincible modesty. His appointment comes as a surprise to nobody but himself. The "wonderful intellect" and "comprehensive mind" of which Sir A. Grant spoke with unbounded admiration fail only in the task of recognising their own distinction. Mr. Ranade's disposition inclined him to a retiring life, secluded from public observation. The public eminence which ambition would never have led him to seek will be dear to him only so far as it supplies occasions for usefulness to his fellow-men. How useful those occasions will be made to prove, nobody who knows Mr. Ranade needs to be told. It is the appointment of such men as he to high office that brings the great departments of State into line with the mass of the people, and teaches them that capacity and industry come by their own even though they are combined with hatred of self-advertisement. Lord Kimberley and Lord Harris have done themselves honour in conferring upon Mr. Ranade a great and noble office, the duties of which we wish him, with hearty congratulations, health and length of days to discharge.

INDIA IN PARLIAMENT.

THE year which is now drawing to a close has been a year of special importance in the history of India. Looking over the records of the protracted Session of Parliament one fixes naturally upon the formation of an Indian Parliamentary Committee as a central starting point. For this work of organisation—which has already resulted in solid advantage—we are largely indebted to the initiative of Sir W. Wedderburn. It was on July 27th that he and Mr. Caine invited to dinner at the House of Commons a few leading members of Parliament with the view of forming them into a recognised Committee to watch the interests of India at Westminster. The idea was not novel. Others had realised before the need of associating India's Parliamentary friends in a compact band. "You and I are," says Thackeray, "but a pair of infinite isolations, with some fellow-"islands a little more or less near to us." What is true in this respect of the human race is still more true of individuals working separately though for a common cause in the House of Commons.

On every ground it seemed desirable to unite the fellow-islands in a continent or, at least, a group. Ten years ago Mr. John Bright became chairman of a similar committee of members "willing to co-"operate on the broad ground of a just and sympa-"thethic policy towards India." Twenty years earlier, thanks chiefly to the efforts of Mr. John Dickinson, the India Reform Society was founded. Both of these organisations aimed specially at securing full Parliamentary inquiry into the government of India. In 1853 the charter of the East India Company was on the point of expiry, and the periodic stock-taking was at hand. In 1885, again, Mr. John Slagg's motion to inquire into the Government of India Act of 1858 was only prevented by a change of Government. The present year saw no diminution, but rather increase of the need of special effort to obtain a full inquiry. For forty years there has been no stock-taking, and the present Viceroy is of opinion that "to leave matters as they "are means for the Government of India hopeless "financial confusion; for the taxpayers of India the "prospect of heavy and unpopular burdens, and for "the country as a whole a fatal and stunting arrest "of its development." In these circumstances the time appeared to be opportune for the revival of an Indian Committee in Parliament which would not only insist upon the imperative need of a stock-taking, but would continually watch and, if need were, direct the course of Indian affairs in the House of Commons. The scheme met with immediate success. A committee, of which Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., was appointed chairman, and Mr. T. H. Roberts, M.P., secretary, was formed. It seems safe to assert that July 27th, the date of this event, will remain a red-letter day in the annals of Indian reform.

But the formation of an Indian Committee is far from being the only fact upon which those who favour a just and sympathetic policy towards India can regard with satisfaction in the year's parliamentary history. The return of Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji for Central Finsbury has shown what Indian pluck and determination could achieve in a political contest in England. It remained for Mr. Naoroji to turn his victory to account, and nobody who knows anything at all of the House of Commons will deny that he has discharged his duty with conspicuous ability and success. Mr. Herbert Paul, who is not in the habit of using superlatives, paid in a recent speech, reported in another column, a remarkable tribute to the capacity displayed by Mr. Naoroji in his great speech for the appointment of a Royal Commission. He was speaking in a language that was not his own. He was addressing a comparatively strange and exceedingly critical assembly. Yet the speech struck Mr. Paul and many other members as being one of the finest speeches to which they had ever listened. Nor is it as a speaker alone that Mr. Naoroji has already won for himself a high place in the esteem of the House of Commons. On all sides he is recognised as second to none in devotion and disinterestedness and loyal effort for a great and worthy cause. It is to be hoped that India will, within a measurable period, return many native representatives to the House of Commons. Their highest praise will be to prove themselves worthy colleagues of Mr. Naoroji. Of Sir W. Wedderburn's election and its significance to Indian reform we have already spoken. In him also India has a friend as zealous as he is disinterested. Without enumerating individuals, we may look briefly at the actual work which has been done. Undoubtedly the most brilliant success of the year is the adoption by the House of Commons of a resolution in favour of simultaneous examinations in India and in England to the Civil Services. The accident of the ballot transferred to Mr. Paul the pleasant task of submitting a motion in support of a reform for which Mr. Naoroji has worked for many years. The success of the motion in the teeth of inevitable opposition from the Government was as satisfactory as the temper in which the Secretary of State for India has set about making the motion operative. Mr. Paul had already won his spurs by the stand he made against the curtailment of trial by jury in Bengal. Successful resistance was also offered to Sir C. Elliott's retrograde attempt to permeate the Local Government Boards with officialism through the chairman and so paralyse Lord Ripon's policy.

In the case of the Madras and Bombay Armies Bill, the Indian Parliamentary Committee has had the pleasure not only of correcting unwisdom in both Houses of Parliament, but also, as it now appears, of turning the eye of the Government of India to the light. The House of Commons, the House of Lords, and the Government of India are now agreed upon the expediency of excluding the Commanders-in-Chief of the armies of Madras and Bombay from the Councils of their Presidencies. One lesson which the friends of India in the House of Commons have learned from the success of their amendment to this Bill, and of their proposal in favour of simultaneous examinations, is the value of exhibiting their strength in the division lobby. Careful observers are of opinion that, if the request (which preceded the recent debate on the Indian Budget) for a Royal Commission of inquiry into India's financial condition could have been pressed to a division, the result would have been favourable. As it was, Mr. A. C. Morton's motion acted as a barrier, and the real debate was robbed of half its value. Even under this disadvantage the motion was far from being in vain. The speeches that were made in support of the motion and the attention which they compelled have sown seeds which are bound to swell a future harvest. The masterly handling of masses of compressed detail, the sober appeals to admitted principles of equity and honour, the enthusiasm, the loyalty and the good sense which the debate revealed showed that, so far as the House of Commons is concerned, Indian affairs stand upon a securer footing than they have known for many a long day. There have been other successes as well. The report of the Departmental Committee on the Indian cantonments will lead to a most necessary reform at the same time that it illustrates with peculiar cogency the special dangers of bureaucratic rule. The currency question has not been allowed to pass unnoticed. The opponents of the opium traffic have secured a

Royal Commission. The question of the defence of India has been so discussed as to show how ill-defined is the policy which is known by the name of the forward school. More than this, a running fire of pointed questions has shown the Secretary of State and the Government of India that there is in the House of Commons a body of men determined to drag the dark deeds of officialdom into the daylight of explanation and publicity. All this is matter for congratulation. Nobody dreams that the goal has been reached or is even in sight. But the race has begun, and begun well. We may depend upon it that the good work will proceed and ultimately prove triumphant not only over the strength of opposition but over that far more formidable foe—the dead weight of listless inactivity and indifference to the interests of India's teeming millions.

INTERVIEW WITH A BOMBAY MANUFACTURER.

THE INDIAN CURRENCY PROBLEM. HOW IT AFFECTS THE RAYAT.

In view of the great importance of the silver question in India, which continues to absorb public interest throughout the commercial world, a representative of India sought out the other day Mr. Jamsetjee N. Tata, the well-known Bombay mill-owner, who is at present staying in London. It seemed probable that Mr. Tata who, besides being a leading representative of the wealthy manufacturers of India, speaks the English language with exceptional fluency and ease, would be able to give a valuable opinion on the subject from his special point of view.

"Do you approve, Mr. Tata," inquired the interviewer, "of the recent decree of Council by which the value of the silver rupee was raised from one shilling and twopence halfpenny to one shilling and fourpence?"

"On the contrary," replied Mr. Tata, "I disapprove of it most strongly. The Government of India has, I hold, taken a step which, however excellent its motives may have been, threatens calamity to every class in India and financial disturbance throughout the commercial world. I do not wish to impute selfish or discreditable intentions to anybody, but it was reasonable to expect that the highly-salaried officials in India would hesitate before adopting a policy which, though advantageous for the time to themselves, promised wholesale disaster to others."

"You mean, of course, that persons who receive their salaries in silver in India and wish to remit a large portion of them to Europe derive obvious advantages from a high rate of exchange?"

"Exactly—so long as the game lasts. But the opinion of careful observers is that it cannot by any conceivable possibility last very long. Observe that I am not complaining for my own part. The step which the Government of India took last June favoured the creditor-class at the expense of the debtor-class. Those of us who had a sum of rupees to come in from any source have profited by the appreciation, while all who had debts to pay are compelled to pay them in coin of enhanced value. Now, in India our poorer classes are so very poor, and indebtedness is widely prevalent. Take, for example, the case of the rayat. His rent has been fixed in advance for a period of thirty years. He pays his way by the sale of produce which is largely exported to Europe. Yet, though the value of his produce is—thanks to the appreciation of the rupee—depreciated by some twelve per cent., nevertheless the Government demands that he shall pay his rent in the enhanced coin. This is a strain which agricultural India cannot bear. Statistics of undisputed authority have shown that the average annual income of inhabitants of India is about twenty-five shillings. As the incomes of wealthy officials, capitalists, and manufacturers are included in this computation, you may imagine what the struggling peasantry of the country obtains. Yet the prosperity of India depends in the last resort upon the prosperity of her cultivating class, and I say that the Government of India is sapping the foundations, and that, if it continues as it has begun, it will soon have a house of cards to tumble about its ears."

"But are not the crops just now good?"

"Yes, they are, and it is that circumstance alone which makes the fool's paradise possible. In two or three years it may be very different and then the Government will find itself under the necessity of reducing the land-tax."

"Meantime, the officials are reaping a harvest?"

"Yes—doubtless with the most disinterested intentions—they are feathering their nests. Not only are they receiving their salaries in rupees of enhanced value but, under the arrangement which permits them to exchange at the rate of eighteen pence up to a certain amount, they have practically received an increase of salaries all round. In other words, the Government was recently crying out that bankruptcy was impending, yet so soon as the officials see, or think they see, an increase of funds they believe that they best serve the interests of the country by distributing the increase among themselves."

"But you say that the capitalist class has profited by the appreciation of the rupee. Why then do you complain?"

"I complain for two reasons. In the first place, I perceive that the additional burden which has been laid upon the oppressed poor of India is flagrantly unjust. In the second place, I perceive that the momentary advantage which may accrue to a section of the population is really a will-'o-the-wisp. The increased return is based upon a flimsy foundation, and no sane capitalist desires an evanescent appearance of prosperity, but general wealth upon a stable footing. In the fight between the Government and the banks the Government, no doubt, must win, though it began the contest at the wrong moment. It would have fared better, for instance, if it had waited until now to issue its decree. But that is really beside the mark, for if the artificial expedient succeeds, it will serve only to put off the evil day."

"How has the action of the Government affected the cotton-spinning industry in India?"

"It has crippled us most seriously. People in England got wind of the Government's intention, and rushed silver into India in unusual amounts to

be coined. The mints were closed. The banks, having large quantities of silver on their hands, raised an outcry. Whereupon the Government of India, under pressure from London, compensated the banks for what were avowedly speculative transactions. Yet, in the meantime, manufacturers in India were incurring a loss of twenty per cent. in China, for example, on about 100,000 bales of yarn —worth some seven million dollars. I have been more than a little surprised to discover the view which English authorities take of facts like these. I was discussing the matter lately with a well-known member of Parliament, and what he said was that' as Lancashire had suffered similarly by the action of foreign governments, it was right that Bombay should suffer by the action of the Government of India. I confess that I do not appreciate the force of the argument. Englishmen seem to have an impression that Indian mills earn something like fifteen per cent. all round. They earn nothing of the kind. During the most prosperous years I believe that the average dividend has never exceeded seven per cent, including agents' commission, and during the last six months I do not think that the average earnings have exceeded three per cent. all round."

"And yet the number of mills has increased, has it not?"

"That is true, no doubt. But the increase has been due not to any intrinsic strength in the industry, but solely to the temptations offered to certain capitalists by the pernicious system in accordance with which commissions are paid on the output quite independently of the profits made by the mills."

"On every ground, therefore, you condemn the action of the Government?"

"On every ground. Indian debt is chiefly out of India—in gold-using countries. This outside creditor has at one sweep profited to the extent of something like 12 per cent. on 200 millions. Such is the price which the Government has paid for an increase of its official salaries. Its policy is bad for the Indian poor, bad for the manufacturers, bad ultimately for the capitalists and for the Government itself, while, outside of India, it has created a general disturbance. This is not as it should be. The business of rulers is to hold the balance evenly and to see that one interest is not profited at another's expense. The Government of India has disappointed us. Our intelligent and educated classes are losing faith, not indeed in the honesty but—what is perhaps still more dangerous—in the capacity of their rulers. The Government has simply transferred money from one of its pockets to another and, after dropping a good deal in the process, invites us to look how much richer it is!"

OUR LONDON LETTER.

There is a delightful set of verses by Mr. Rudyard Kipling on Lord Roberts in the Christmas number of the *Pall Mall Magazine*. It is the private soldier's appreciation of the great General, and though he declares it "ain't no bloomin' ode," if it accurately portrays his feelings not all the dithyrambic effusions of would-be Laureates put together could frame so touching and welcome a tribute. It is called (of course) "Bobs," and here is one of its eight very keen and frank verses:

"What 'e does not know o' war
Gen'ral Bobs,
You can arst the shop next door—
Can't they, Bobs?
Oh, 'e's little, but he's wise;
'E's a terror for 'is size,
An'—'e—*does—not—advertise*—
Do yer, Bobs?"

Mr. Kipling, in one of his "Barrack-Room Ballads," describes with some satire the miseries necessary and unnecessary which the British soldier endures. An example may be found in the case of the two soldiers who died from exposure in the recent snowstorm. They and their comrades were time-expired men from India, and in their Indian kit were sent to a fort on Portsdown Hill. Twenty other men were also found lying half-dead in the snow. The surgeon stated that men fresh from the tropics should not be sent to a station so exposed. The jury also added a rider to this effect, and a military inquiry is to be made. From this tale it is clear that the life of Tommy Atkins in these piping times of peace is an unconsidered trifle. In spite of it all, however, the next draft from India will be ready to sing in Mr. Kipling's music:—

"They'll turn us out of Portsmouth wharf, in cold an' wet an' rain,
All wearin' Injian cotton kit, but we will not complain;
They'll kill us of pneumonia—for that's their little way—
But damn the chills and fever, men, we're goin' 'ome to-day!"

On the afternoon of November 23, in the presence of a large number of ladies and gentlemen, Lord Reay unveiled a tablet which has been erected at the Imperial Institute to perpetuate the memory of a talented young Parsee lady Awabai Bhownaggree, whose death a few years ago caused much regret to her many friends in England and India. The memorial occupies a prominent position in the handsome colonnade that has been erected at the expense of her brother, Mr. M. M. Bhownaggree, C.I.E., to connect the main building of the Institute with its neighbour the India Museum. The ceremony was a short one, and subsequently most of the company adjourned to the "Temporary Grand Hall," as it is called, where Sir William Moore read a paper putting forward the familiar arguments in favour of non-interference with the opium traffic. Unless something is done to make the "Temporary Grand Hall" more comfortable in the winter the audiences at these lectures are not likely to be very numerous.

Surgeon-General Sir William Moore certainly goes the whole hog on the opium question. Here are a few testimonials to the drug and those who use it, culled from his lecture at the Imperial Institute:

"As a matter of fact, one might see more immorality in a London gin-shop in half an hour, even on a Sunday night, than in the opium shop during a whole year."

"Opium brightened the intellect, temporarily strengthened the system, and promoted physical activity and digestion."

"The Chinamen in Calcutta—all opium-smokers—were the most healthy, peaceful, and industrious of all classes."

"The cessation of the growth and sale of opium would debar thousands from a harmless enjoyment."

Sir William, who was Dean of the Medical Faculty in Bombay University, and is an Honorary Physician to the Queen, made, it is true, one or two qualifying statements as to the harm of excess, which may or may not be considered important. But the conviction which comes of experience no argument can shake, and did not Sir William also say that "he himself had often smoked opium, and really did not see where the wickedness and immorality came in?" To be sure, any drug which can at once (1) brighten the intellect, (2) strengthen the system, (3) promote physical activity, and (4) cure indigestion is a veritable panacea. More could hardly be said for it if it were a patent pill. But (asks the *Westminster Gazette*) would not any non-medical man who claimed as much for any specific as Sir William Moore claims for opium be in danger of being written down a quack?

Mr. E. H. Bayley, M.P. for North Camberwell, has just been elected a member of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress. "Mr. Edward Hobson Bayley is" (says the *Pall Mall* "Mems. about Members") "a maker of water-carts, fire-escapes, and omnibuses in the borough—employing in all some one thousand hands—and is interested in various cab and tramway enterprises. At one time he was chairman of the London Road Car Company. He is a son of the late Dr. Bayley, a staunch Liberal, who presided at the first Anti-Corn Law meeting in Manchester, and, like his father, he is a Swedenborgian. He was educated privately in this country and abroad; and is said to be an accomplished linguist as well as an amateur musician. He has for many years been a prominent man both in the parochial concerns and in the Liberal politics of Southwark." Mr. Bayley moved the recent motion in the House of Commons for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the financial condition of India.

The Earl of Elgin was entertained by the Northbrook Society at a banquet at the Imperial Institute on November 16th. The Earl of Northbrook presided, and there was a large attendance of members and guests, among those present being the Earl of Kimberley, the Earl of Rosebery, Lord Reay, and numerous Indian notabilities.

The debate on the Matabele question which took place in the House of Commons on November 9th, showed Mr. A. J. Balfour in a new character—that of a punster. Referring to the Chartered Company he said, "the success of the experiment depends and must depend, partly on the *personnel* of the Company, partly on the funds which are at the disposal of the Company; and so far from associating myself with the attacks which have to-day been made on the Chartered Company, I must say, looking back over its history, I am of opinion that we have been exceptionally fortunate both in the man who has been the guiding spirit and animating soul of this great organisation, and in the fact that he had at his back resources which he has freely and even lavishly used for the purpose not only of extending the operations of his own company, but also, and even more directly and immediately, of extending the blessings of civilisation, of extending railways and telegraphs, of extending roads"—but here the eloquent period was cut short by a storm of laughter, and "The Extension of Rhodes" has since been the recognised name of the operations in Matabeleland. It is to be hoped, by the way, that the truculent sentiments expressed during the debate by some honourable members do not faithfully represent the attitude of the House of Commons towards uncivilised tribes.

Mr. Campbell-Bannerman lately received a deputation from the London Reform Union which discussed with him the conditions of labour under the British Government. In addition to much else that was interesting, the deputation gave two instances in which large orders from India and elsewhere, involving the employment of thousands of men, had been refused because we could not afford to give our Eastern empire credit. India, wanting seventeen million cartridges, accordingly had to transfer her work from Woolwich to a private firm which could offer her the credit that the Government of the richest country in the world could not extend to her. Most people will be inclined to wonder why we cannot run the empire with the capital reserve which every private adventurer regards as indispensable to his business. The moral of the whole question is that we have yet to transform the entire conditions of public labour so as to bring it on a level with the best variety of private employment.

The Queen's Indian Secretary, the Munshi Abdul Karim, who has been visiting his native land, returned to England some three weeks ago in order to resume his duties upon the arrival of the Court from Scotland. The Munshi was accompanied by his wife and daughter, both of whom were closely veiled, the lady being shrouded in a cloak of yellow stuff and the girl in a darker garment, the Oriental coverings completely concealing the features and figures of the wearers. During their journey every attention, by command of Her Majesty, was shown to the Munshi and his family, who travelled from London in a South-Western saloon with drawn curtains, and on reaching Windsor in the evening were conveyed in a Royal carriage to Frogmore Cottage, where appartments have been provided for them.

It is said that some dissatisfaction is secretly expressed by members of the royal household and by the royal underlings, because of the marked consideration extended by the Queen to her Indian Munshi. So far as the minor members of the Indian establishment are concerned, the English servants have successfully resisted the suggestion that they should wait upon them. But with the Munshi himself it is different. The quarters which he is occupying have always been associated with the more dignified side of the royal establishment, and his social position is, of course, on an entirely higher level than that of the late John Brown, whose place is now largely occupied in practice, though not in name, by the two chief Indian servants. The Munshi, in fact, is a member of the household, quotable from day to day in the *Court Circular* as regularly as the

Equerry in Waiting or Mr. Muther, the German librarian.

At the beginning of the month several missionaries attached to the Presbyterian Church left Birkenhead by the steamship City of Bombay for Calcutta, *en route* for various mission Stations in India. The party included Mrs. Morrison, who returns to join her husband and resume her work in the Zenanas, Miss Thomson, who has been home on furlough, the Rev. Alfred A. Cooper (the first ordained missionary sent from the Presbyterian Church of England to India) and Mrs. Cooper, and Miss Brunton, who holds an appointment under the Women's Missionary Association. The Welsh Presbyterian Church sent by the same vessel the Rev. J. Ceredig Evan, and the Rev. C. L. Stephens, and Mrs. Stephens, who are to work in the Khasia Hills district.

One of the best stories told of the late Sir Andrew Clark is the following. At a dinner-party the lady sitting next to him at table passed a dish to which he helped himself plentifully. He asked if she did not like it, as it was excellent. She replied "Oh! yes, I like it, but my physician forbids me to eat it." "Stuff and nonsense," said Sir Andrew, "it could not hurt anyone. Who is your physician?" And the lady, whom the great doctor had forgotten, answered, with a demure twinkle in her eye, "Sir Andrew Clark."

The *Oxford Magazine* gives the following amusing anecdote of the late Professor Jowett. A superior person was reading an essay. In the course of his elaborate periods he enlarged upon our debt to France. To France, he said, we owe the best of our art, the best of our literature, in short—"Do you know," interrupted the Master brusquely, "what is written over the gate of hell?" Unsuspectingly the undergraduate hazarded the inevitable quotation from Dante. "No," said the Master, "you are wrong. The inscription is this: '*Ici on parle français.*'"

EDINBURGH INDIAN ASSOCIATION.

SPEECH BY MR. HERBERT W. PAUL, M.P.

On October 27th the Edinburgh Indian Association entertained Mr. Herbert W. Paul, M.P. for the Southern Division of Edinburgh, to luncheon. Replying to the toast of his health, which was proposed by Mr. T. M. Nair, President of the Association, Mr. Paul said:—Nothing could possibly give me greater pleasure than to accept the invitation which Mr. Nair was good enough to offer me from you, and to come here and be your guest to-day. I only regret—not on my own account, but on yours—that so good a lunch should have to be followed by a bad speech. ("No, no.") But with regard to what Mr. Nair has been good enough to say, I have taken some interest in several questions connected with India, and have brought them before the House of Commons. And, gentlemen, if I am to make a clean breast of it, I must confess that though my interest in India has always been great, as the interest of very educated Briton ought to be—(applause)—I think I was induced to take a special interest in Indian affairs by the very kind and invaluable support which I received at the time of the general election from Mr. Nair and Mr. Mullick and from other members of your Association—a support for which I can never be too grateful. Mr. Nair has been good enough to refer to two questions in particular—the question of trial by jury in Bengal and also in Assam, and the question of holding simultaneous examinations for the Civil Service in India and England. But those were both questions which did not require any peculiar knowledge of Indian affairs to appreciate and to understand. In the case of the interference with trial by jury the evidence was before us. Any intelligent and educated person could judge for himself, and could perceive, as it seemed to me, that this great security for personal freedom, which we value so highly and which we have extended to other possessions of the Crown, was being impaired and diminished in the case of a large class of Her Majesty's subjects on wholly inadequate grounds. Mr. Nair said that whatever Government might be in office the administration of India remained Conservative. I am afraid that there is a good deal of truth in that remark, but I think it only justice to the present Secretary of State for India to say that when the facts of the Bengal case were brought clearly before him, and when he perceived how great was the change which Sir Charles Elliott had been allowed to make, and how slender was the evidence upon which it had been made, he with all reasonable promptitude took the necessary steps to have the obnoxious order cancelled and withdrawn. With regard to the question of simultaneous examinations I do not think that we can at all find fault with Lord Kimberley's attitude. Lord Kimberley was placed in a very difficult position. It is true that he had a resolution of the House of Commons behind him; otherwise he could have done nothing. But he had against him every single member of the Indian Council at home. They recorded, I think unanimously, but at all events with not more than one or two exceptions, against the decision which the House of Commons had arrived at, and they all recommended that no notice should be taken of such an insignificant body as the House of Commons—(laughter)—and that no communication whatever on the subject should be addressed to the Government of India. Well, Lord Kimberley overruled them all. (Applause.) He persisted in having this resolution sent out to Calcutta, and it is only fair that we should wait a short time in order to see what answer the Indian Government may send. Well, now, gentlemen, as you all know, there is a change in the Governor-Generalship of India. (Applause.) I think we have some reason to congratulate ourselves as Liberals, and from sentiments of patriotism, upon the appointment of Lord Elgin. It is true that Lord Elgin has not had very much official experience. I believe that in the kingdom of Fife, where he is best known, his reputation as an administrator is exceedingly high; and I happen to know that although he only held the office of First Commissioner of Works for a few months, those who were employed under him, the keen and not always very kindly critics of a permanent Civil Service, had

formed the very highest opinion of Lord Elgin's capacity for public business. But above and beyond that, I think we may have some confidence that a man who has stood by the Liberal cause in difficult and delicate times, and who lately did himself honour by voting in the House of Lords for a great measure of justice to Ireland—(applause)—will feel that his duty in India is not merely to ascertain and follow the counsels of his official advisers, but, availing himself, as it will be his duty to do, of their information, to form his own independent opinion as a statesman of what measures are best for the benefit of the people over whom he is called to rule. (Applause.) Gentlemen, in reading criticisms upon the resolution of the House of Commons which I had the honour to move, and upon other proposals for increasing the share which the natives of India take in the government of their own country, I have been struck by the extraordinary historical ignorance of the critics. (Laughter.) They seem to think that these proposals are modern inventions of what they call the new Radical party; in fact, that they only sprang into being when Mr. Gladstone took up Home Rule in the year 1886. Why, gentleman, everybody who knows anything of the relations between this country and India is aware that this is the good old policy of Sir William Bentinck and Lord Macaulay. It is the policy of some of the best and wisest men who ever ruled India. (Applause.) It is the policy adopted at a time when, if you will allow me to say so, the capacity of the natives of India for self-government was in many respects less obvious than it is now. Those great men held that it was the duty of this country to India to do their best to enable themselves to be superseded, and that the greatest honour which in its administration of India this country could possibly obtain was to be able to say that they had so administered the affairs of that great country, of which they are trustees, that they could safely leave the inhabitants of India to manage their own affairs, and to be responsible for their own government and security. (Applause.) Gentlemen, that is not a new policy. It is an old policy—the good, sound policy of the old Liberal administration of India. What is new is the reactionary episode of which the late Lord Lytton was the ill-omened hero. I trust that of that episode, and of its fruits, we have got rid. I hope, and believe, that the new Governor-General will be less ready than his immediate predecessor to follow blindly the counsels of those whom he may find installed and ready to advise him. It would be impossible for him to give his sanction to such an extraordinary notification as that which Sir Charles Elliott brought before Lord Lansdowne, and which Lord Lansdowne, apparently without much thought about the matter, ratified. Gentlemen, before I sit down I should like to be allowed to propose the health of your Association. It is not for me to say how much benefit you confer upon your own countrymen by your united efforts, but I am quite certain that you are of the very greatest profit and advantage to us politicians at home. Many of us are obliged, from the necessities of the case, to form opinions about Indian affairs without any very special knowledge. I desire myself to express my gratitude for the assistance which I have derived from Mr. Naoroji. Mr. Naoroji has always placed at my disposal the vast sources of his information about all sides and aspects of Indian affairs, and I cannot help expressing my admiration for the efforts which Mr. Naoroji has made for his country in the House of Commons—(hear, hear)—and especially for his speech upon the Indian Budget, which I think, considering the conditions of difficulty under which he necessarily labours in addressing a very critical assembly in a language which is not his own, was one of the most remarkable efforts to which I ever had the pleasure of listening in the course of my life. Gentlemen, I hope you may long retain the services of Mr. Naoroji in the House of Commons. (Applause.) I hope that Mr. Naoroji may in future Parliaments be assisted by native gentlemen not less able and accomplished than himself; but I can assure you that whether that be so or not there are some British members of Parliament who will never slacken in their interest in all Indian affairs, but will always do everything in their power to promote what they believe to be the best interests of India, and as far as possible in accordance with the opinion of the inhabitants of India themselves. (Loud applause.)

ABOLITIONISTS IN CONFERENCE.

(From "The Woman's Herald.")

It is nearly four o'clock. The large room in Westminster Town Hall is full of faces, young, old, worn, eager. Here and there the dark skin of a Hindu makes a picturesque shadow among the paler complexions. The speakers have not yet arrived. The platform is empty save for the presence of a group of delicate white chrysanthemums. Subdued talking goes on at the back of the hall. Before me, near the front, two ladies are speaking, creating a little wave of sound in the sea of silence.

"The times are full of movement," says the younger lady. "When I was a girl I longed to live in the rush of things, and I am thankful that I am in the midst of such questions as the one we shall talk of to-day. Modern life is so eager, so full of thought that has the force of action."

Her companion looks timidly round.

"I don't know if the keen interest in—in purity and legislation on it is quite—quite womanly," she hesitates.

"Womanly! The times have made the woman!" the other exclaims, and she continues with unconscious irony :—

> So God fulfils Himself in many ways,
> Lest one good custom should corrupt the world.

Before the humour of this quotation—in that connection—had ceased to please me, the speakers file in. On the left of the platform Mrs. Josephine Butler, Mr. Stansfeld, M.P., Professor Stuart, M.P., Mr. and Mrs. Price Hughes, are among the well-known personalities that fill the chairs. To the right of the platform the House of Commons is represented by Mr. Caine, Mr. John Edward Ellis, Sir Wm. Wedderburn, and Mr. Webb. Scotland sends a son of the Kirk; and literature and the law

has its hostage in Mr. Percy Bunting, by whose side is Mrs. Henry Wilson, who will by-and-bye move the meeting with eloquent and forceful words.

After the letters of apology for absence and sympathy with the objects of the meeting are read, and among these are letters from Miss Frances Willard and Mrs. Fawcett, Mr. Stansfeld without delay takes his place as Chairman, and strikes the keynote of the meeting by touching at once on the Parliamentary history of the movement affecting the Cantonment Acts. In a few graphic sentences the whole miserable system of civil and military connivance at a great evil is painted before a keenly-interested audience, who responded enthusiastically to the speaker's eulogy of the difficult and delicate work of Mrs. Andrew and Dr. Kate Bushnel. Then Mr. Stansfeld briefly sketches the way in which some reform at least has been accomplished, and concludes with a stern setting forth of England's duty on this question: "When we have acted so as to prevent a repetition of the iniquities staining our rule in India; when we have secured the extermination—not the modification merely—of the vile system, then, and not till then, we may rest."

Then comes the moving of the first resolution by the Rev. J. P. Gledstone.

"That this Conference expresses its great satisfaction with the Report of the Departmental Committee appointed to enquire whether the Rules, Regulations, and practices in the Indian Cantonments were in accord with the Resolution of the House of Commons of June 5th, 1888, and it rejoices that the iniquitous system pursued by various military authorities in India in persistent violation of the order of the House of Commons has been completely exposed and condemned.

With this is associated the following resolution:—

"That this Conference expresses its indignation that in spite of the condemnation and prohibition by the House of Commons of the compulsory examination of women and the licensing and regulating of Prostitution in India, the military authorities in certain Cantonments have continued or renewed the practices condemned."

Mr. Gledstone begins his speech with a David-like pæan on the discomfiture of the witnesses for the defence of the official case. Indeed, the speech throughout reminds us of a modern setting of "Let God arise! Let His enemies be scattered! Let them also that fear Him flee before Him." With an eloquent proposal that the law-maker in high places, being guilty, should be punished with the punishment of the law-breaker of low degree, Mr. Gledstone moves the resolution, and resumes his seat.

Mr. Walter Maclaren, M.P., seconds the resolution; his clever, humerous manner contrasting oddly with the suave tones and marshal spirit of the preceding speaker. The touching confidence of Lord Roberts in the administration of the laws affecting his own soldiers is brightly alluded to; and then in a powerful speech Mr. Maclaren protests against the colonial civil power that renders impotent the constitutional measures of the Home Government.

The speech of the meeting is made by Mrs. Henry Wilson, who gives two telling reasons for indignation at the civil and military authorities in India. It behoves us to be indignant, she says, in a voice breaking with emotion, when we remember that we who claim to be Christianising India are being misrepresented to the natives of India. The picture is very clear before our eyes as we listen. We see the Englishman professedly carrying in one hand the Bread of Life, while with the other he hurls at the hungry people the stones of cruelty and lust. And then Mrs. Wilson shows us the evil re-acting upon ourselves, the curse coming back to roost in our own country, for she paints in vivid colours the picture of a young soldier leaving a pure and sheltered home for an atmosphere polluted with officially-protected vice. And then the same young soldier is seen returning to sow broadcast at home the evil and disease he has acquired abroad. Mrs. Wilson does not finish her speech without making the wise suggestion that parents should inculcate purity in their sons and daughters so that in time to come the making of these shameful laws would be impossible. The lady concludes with a tribute to Mrs. Butler from a recent Diocesan Conference where the Clergy, while lamenting Mrs. Butler's mistaken action in the C. D. Acts, saw the hopelessness of destroying her work because "Mrs. Butler is invincible."

I have not space to refer at length to the very able and telling speech of Mr. Caine, nor to Sir William Wedderburn's clever illustration of Lord Roberts's ignorance by the bulky antediluvian monster who could not tell what was going on at the other end of him.

Mr. Webb, M.P., who represented the Irish Members, spoke last, and the double resolution, being put to the meeting, was carried unanimously.

Before me two ladies rise, relieved at the conclusion of the long sitting, and one murmurs softly to the other: "You were quite right; it is well for women to take their part in questions like these."

Correspondence.

MR. JUSTICE MAHMUD'S SUCCESSOR.

To the Editor of "India."

Sir,—It is quite true, as your correspondent in page 333 of the last issue of India states, that the course which the Government of the North-Western Provinces may take, in the matter of the appointment of a native judge on the bench of the Alláhabad High Court, in succession to Mr. Justice Mahmud, about to retire, is anxiously watched.

It is anxiously watched because (i) it is well known from circumstances prior to Mr. Mahmud's appointment that nothing short of the positive command of the highest authorities will induce the local government to appoint a native, and more especially a vakil, or Indian lawyer, to such a post; (ii) because the Hindus of the North-West Provinces have a strong claim that one of their nationality should be appointed, and (iii) because it is reasonably claimed that vakils or Indian lawyers of the High Court, of whom there are a good number who have been High Court vakils for over ten years, have a preferential right to the appointment, no matter what their race or religion may be.

The vakils of the High Court of the North-West Provinces have never ceased urging that they have, since 1886, when the High Court at Alláhábad was first established, been unfairly excluded from these appointments.

The High Court charters provide that the bench of judges shall be composed of three classes, as near as may be, in equal proportion—that is to say, covenanted civilian judges one-third, barrister judges one-third, and the remaining third was allotted to vakils.

Mr. Justice Mahmud was not a vakil or Indian lawyer, but a barrister judge; and though a native born, he had adopted English dress and English habits, and his appointment, therefore, did not fulfil the reasonable claims of the natives of India.

It is therefore hoped that Lord Kimberley will, in filling up the vacancy caused by the retirement of Mr. Justice Mahmud, see that due consideration is given to the claims of the vakils of the High Court, and not allow the provisions of the High Court charter as to the appointment of a vakil to remain unfulfilled.

The vakils of the High Court, North-West Provinces, of ten years standing are in number about thirty. Several of them are graduates of an Indian university. They are all able to plead in two or three languages (of which English is, of course, one). They have passed very strict examinations in Hindu, Muhammadan, Indian, and English law, and their Indian legal training fits them for the duties of the High Court bench and bar in a far greater degree than the Indian legal training of either covenanted civilian officials or English barristers, and their exclusion from the bench for now twenty-seven years is looked upon by the native population as unfair, a breach of Her Majesty's Proclamation, and an evasion of the promises of the British Government. These High Court vakils of the North-West Provinces are composed of various classes, as the following approximate list will show, namely, Hindus: 4 North-West Provinces Brahmins; 6 North-West Provinces Kayasths; 2 North-West Provinces Jains; 2 Cashmiri Pundits; 1 Guzerati Brahmin; 1 Indian-born Englishman; 4 or 5 Muhammadans; 1 Eurasian; 1 Native Christian; 4 or 5 Bengalis.

When the vacancy occurred in 1881 Sir George Couper was Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Provinces, and Lord Ripon was the Viceroy at Calcutta. Sir George Couper having been ordered to report who among the Indian vakils of the High Court North-West Provinces was the most fit to fill the vacancy, asked the judges of the High Court, then composed of two barristers and two civilians, to favour him with their opinions, and they accordingly did so. They discussed at considerable length and without much delicacy of feeling the personal and other qualifications and disqualifications of five leading High Court vakils (namely, two Cashmiri Pundits and two Kayasths, all belonging to the North-West Provinces, and one Bengali Brahmin), and they reported, in effect, that though they were all very able and learned men, not one of them was fit for the post except the Bengali, who was not eligible because Bengalis were already sufficiently represented in the High Court of Bengal at Calcutta.

This report of the High Court, North-West Provinces, though strictly private and privileged, was by some mistake in the office of the Lieutenant-Governor, printed and published in the Quarterly Report of work done by the North-West Provinces Government and a copy was placed in the High Court Library, where it was open to the perusal of any one who chose to read it.

Its perusal, of course, gave great offence to the native gentlemen concerned, one of whom was the Vakil entrusted with all the litigation in which Government was a party and who had held the post of Government Pleader with great credit for a number of years.

Sir George Couper, in due course, forwarded the judges' report to the Viceroy, and expressed his inability to select a native vakil for the post of High Court Judge. At this stage Mr. Syed Mahmud, who had practised as a barrister for five years and had been made a district judge in Oudh by Lord Lytton's administration some three years before, was, to the surprise of many, appointed.

To the uninitiated, and to those at a distance, this appointment seemed to be in some respects a compliance with the provisions of the charter constituting the High Court, for was not Mr. Syed Mahmud a native? But inasmuch as the gentleman in question was a barrister, and had abandoned the native dress and habits for that belonging to Europeans, it clearly did not comply with the provision as to vakil judges in the manner intended by those who framed the charter, and it was no satisfaction whatever to the expectations of the Hindu community.

The vakils of the High Court, N.W.P., have an association of their own, of many years' standing, which is intended to give the Government all the assistance possible in the ascertainment of their hopes and wishes. It is reported that they have held a meeting and have signed and forwarded a petition embodying their views to Lord Kimberley. If this is so, there is little doubt that such petition, when received, will be carefully considered; but if they have not ventured to specify in their petition whom among their number they consider to be the best qualified for the post, would it not be a graceful act on the part of the Secretary of State to instruct the Local Government to ask the vakils to elect one of their body, informing them at the same time what are the particular qualifications which, in the opinion of Government, the one they may elect should possess? It is probable that the Local Government, if forced to make a selection, would ignore the vakils' association and consult one of the civilian judges, who would naturally favour the pretensions of some insignificant obsequious kayasth, who would be no credit to the Hindu community or to the Government.

The task of selection would be not only lightened but would probably be brought to the most satisfactory result by taking the opinion of the vakils themselves.—I am, etc.,

16th Nov., 1893. Vakil.

NOTICE.

We beg to remind subscribers that, with the next number (January) of India, a new volume will begin. Subscriptions and order-forms should be forwarded as soon as may be, to the Manager, at the offices, 84 and 85 Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W. Cheques and Post Office Orders should be made payable to W. Douglas Hall.

INDIA

is published on the 1st of each month in London, and will be despatched to India by the mail preceding or succeeding the day of publication, according to circumstances.

Supplements will be published, free to subscribers, from time to time, containing VERBATIM *reports of debates on Indian questions in Parliament, and documents of historical or current interest.*

The subscription to INDIA *is 6s. a year for England and 6 rupees for India, post free.*

INDIA *represents not only the political, but the literary and industrial revival of India, and appeals to all classes interested in the development of the country.*

All contributions, whether articles or paragraphs, will be carefully considered, and, when used, will be paid for, if payment is requested at the time of sending. Unused contributions will be returned, if a stamped and directed wrapper or envelope is enclosed, not otherwise.

Correspondence on Indian subjects generally is invited, but all letters must be authenticated by the real name and address of the writer.

*It is intended to establish a special department, called '*INDIA IN ENGLAND,*' if correspondents will kindly forward information of interest regarding Indian students and other Indians resident in the United Kingdom.*

The attention of publishers and editors of magazines is called to the scheme of publishing a monthly INDIAN BIBLIOGRAPHY, *and their co-operation is invited.*

All communications for the EDITOR *must be addressed to the offices, 84 and 85,* PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

All remittances, subscriptions, orders for copies, etc., must be addressed to the MANAGER, *at the offices, 84 and 85,* PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

INDIA *presents unique advantages as an* ADVERTISING MEDIUM. *All communications as to Advertisements must be sent to the Advertisement Manager, at the offices, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, London, S.W.*

Copies of INDIA *can be procured from the offices of the Paper, Mr.* ELLIOT STOCK, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C., and from Messrs.* DEIGHTON, BELL AND CO., *Trinity Street, Cambridge. And to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

INDIA.

LONDON, 1 DECEMBER, 1893.

HOW TO POPULARISE THE INDIAN QUESTION.

BY MR. MICHAEL DAVITT, EX-M.P.

THE demand for a Royal Commission for an enquiry into the whole system of Indian administration is likely to be resisted by the entire Tory and the bulk of the Liberal party for some years to come. The British mind is not yet sufficiently informed on the A. B. C. of the Indian question to be got to look with favour upon a proposal which is fraught with apprehensions of possible danger to the Empire in what is commonly believed to be its most vulnerable point. It will therefore be a wiser policy to proceed along the lines of least resistance and to advocate such a development of representative Provincial Government as will appear to the public of Great Britain and Ireland to be the natural and safest course for reform in Indian rule to take. Note must always be taken of British fears and prejudices in every proposal connected with India. As the best system of government for such a country would be one of adaptability which could be grafted upon customs peculiar to the people of India, so should the proposals and reforms urged by the National Congress movement run upon lines familiar to the ordinary political experience and intelligence of the average British mind. More light must be given to the public before it instructs the House of Commons to concede the demand of the leaders of native Indian opinion for the appointment of the Royal Commission in question, and this light and leading will be largely supplied if the Congress meets next year in London and thereby provides an object lesson in practical Indian politics to the people of the United Kingdom.

I do not know whether the Congress intends to hold its next Session of 1894 in London. I hope it does.

Bringing the Congress of 1894 to London will be a step in the right direction, but it will not be enough. It should be followed by a carefully organised propaganda, in public meetings and appropriate literature, throughout Great Britain. Native speakers—the best that can be got—should be included among the one hundred representative delegates who are to form what will be the historic Tenth Congress of the Indian National movement, and, the business of this Session in London concluded, prominent leaders and speakers should then visit the most active provincial centres of political activity and expound the end and aim, the plans and proposals of the agitation for a reform in the government of their country. Large meetings and a fair treatment from the press could confidently be counted upon.

For the purposes of such a propaganda, the powerful help of the photographer's art should not be overlooked. People everywhere like pictures. A striking picture illustrative of the subject is sometimes more convincing than a speech. The British people are becoming familiar with the magic lantern as an adjunct to a public meeting. Their interest in the grievances and remedial demands of their Indian fellow-subjects will be increased if efforts are made to give them true glimpses of the real India—the India of the half-starved and salt-taxed rayat whose yearly income reaches forty shillings—not the India of princely nabobs, and ko-hi-nurs, and bejewelled temples which is more familiar to the uninformed British imagination. Photographs are wanted of rayats and labourers, their homes and surroundings, wives and children, working tools and methods of cultivation—anything and everything which can give the British public an accurate conception of the actual industrial and social condition of the 300,000,000 of "British subjects" who are governed in the name of the people of these three islands without being allowed any voice whatever in the ruling of their own destinies.

Among the delegates to the tenth Congress, to meet in London, should be the Rájá Bahadur of Maimansingh. The facts of his abominable prosecution and persecution at the hands of British magistrate Phillips should be cited by himself to English audiences, in order to give in the most striking manner possible an illustration of the intolerable evil which attends the administration of justice to the Indian people under the vicious system of uniting the judicial and executive functions in one. A native magistrate with judicial duties alone would never have perpetrated so unwarrantable a piece of gratuitous injustice and insult as this case revealed. To arrest so highly-esteemed a man on so trivial a pretext and, forgetful of the esteem of the people for the Rájá, to put him in the dock alongside of a

common Muhammadan malefactor, was a "mistake" which ought to have merited a somewhat severer "punishment" than Mr. Phillips' removal to a more favourable locality. Such an object-lesson in dispensing Anglo-Indian justice would be worth twenty speeches in Parliament condemnatory of this system, and it is to be hoped that the Rájá will be induced to attend the London Congress and impeach this monstrous practice of combining the duties of the policeman with the functions of the magistrate in the interests of Indian law and order. It will further be an easy but necessary task to show by other instances how the strong reccommendation of the Commission of 1860 on this vital matter has been ignored by the Council of India. The extension of trial by jury throughout India will be a proposal of a kindred nature that is sure to meet with a friendly response in the birthplace of that safeguard of the liberty of the subject.

Another step, if somewhat more hazardous, is certainly not less practical than the assembling of the Indian Congress in London, and that is, to increase the number of India's direct representatives in the House of Commons should claim the earnest attention of the coming meeting at Lahore. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's personal popularity and close identity with the Home Rule and Progressive movements should make this a much easier labour now than it was when he first attempted the seemingly impossible task of breaking down an absurd but strongly-rooted racial prejudice. The hon. member for Central Finsbury has served India faithfully and well in London, and richly deserves the compliment of the presidency of the coming Congress at Lahore. But in no other of the many ways in which he has laboured in the cause of India has he advanced its interests more than in identifying himself with every movement in Great Britain and Ireland which has had for object the social or political advancement of the people of these countries. His has not been a mere expression of sympathy, but an active, earnest, actual participation in whatever kind of work was best calculated to promote the interests of the masses. The House of Commons would be all the better, in every useful way, for more men of his kind and character. They, if like him, would be better representatives of British workingmen than the ordinary "M.P.ship"-seekers and mere professional parliamentarians who are frequently selected to stand for advanced constituencies because they have money enough to carry on the ordinary local work of registration, etc., without making any charge upon the pockets of the local committee. A representative of the Indian people, who could or would do this seemingly necessary part of the duty of standing for British Radical seats, ought to be a more useful and more acceptable member than the ordinary London party hanger-on who haunts the National Liberal Club, and is ready at a moment's notice to profess Whig, Liberal, Radical, or even "Labor" principles when the chance of becoming an M.P. presents itself. Until payment of election expenses and of members becomes law, the working classes of Great Britain will find it impossible to secure direct parliamentary representation to any appreciable extent. Unlike the Irish, the English, Scotch, and Welsh workers will not support a People's Party by voluntary contributions. Here, then, is a good chance for the Indian National Congress. It ought not to be a difficult task to return three or four more Indian colleagues with Mr. Naoroji at the next General Election, on the Progressive ticket of Home Rule and Labour legislation, *plus* the Indian people's question. The work which Mr. Naoroji has already achieved in obtaining the assent of the House of Commons to that plank in the Congress platform which demanded the open Competition Examination for the Indian Civil Service to be held simultaneously in England and in India, and the acceptance of the member for Finsbury's amendment by the Commons and Government on the Madras and Bombay Armies Bill, will demonstrate to the delegates at Lahore what can be done for their people and country through direct Indian representation at Westminster. The problem for their consideration is a simple one. Increase the number of Naorojis in the Imperial Parliament, and more points in the Congress programme will soon be assented to by the British House of Commons.

It is the economic rather than the national or political part of that programme which will attract most support and excite least fears in and outside of Parliament. The reason of this is obvious. The labour movement in Great Britain, the struggle of the working population for material and social betterment; for direct municipal and Parliamentary representation; for less hours of labour, and better protection from the law for their interests, will give to the economic and popular aspect of the Indian question a relationship in similarity of motive and purpose, which will ensure a hearing and a sympathy from the industrial democracy—the majority of the electorate of Great Britain—which the purely political or national phase of the Congress platform could not, at present, possibly excite. There is the bogey of Russian designs upon India to be kept in mind. This fear will be allayed not aroused by proposals which have for end and aim the social improvement, the educational advancement, the moral and material uplifting of the 150,000,000 workers in India who have no voice but one in the Imperial Parliament, and no surer way of obtaining redress for grievances than through the Parliamentary support of the working classes of Great Britain and Ireland. Russian plans cannot compete with English rule upon a rational policy of this kind, as would be possible, to the English mind, if the political rather than the economic part of the Indian problem were put in the foreground of the Congress programme. A barrier of social content, created by improving the home, the industrial education and the general well-being of the rayat population would be an infinitely stronger and more enduring protection than scientific frontiers against Muscovite designs upon India, and these are the lines upon which the Congress movement should work if its full programme of representative rule is ever to be carried for the Indian people.

Nor should it be overlooked that England is still, largely, a nation of shopkeepers. The prospects of trade with the Indian Empire will be a most important factor in the formation of British opinion on the Indian question. At present such trade in ex-

ports of British and Irish produce to India averages about two shillings per head of India's population. This comparatively small volume of trade would be much increased if the material prosperity of the people of India grew, as it would necessarily grow under conditions of improved and more economic administration by the natives of the country, abolition of the salt tax, spread of manual education and development of provincial government, so as to give more all-round confidence and encouragement to native industry, enterprise and opinion. The prospect of an addition of a few shillings more per head of population to the existing trade between Great Britain and India, as a result of such reforms, would stimulate British interest in the native Indian question, and it cannot be a difficult task for the National Congress to demonstrate the certain growth and expansion of this commercial link with India by diminishing to the utmost extent the destructive evils of administration by foreigners, and of the consequent exhausting drain of the wealth of the country, as a direct result of the application of the policy and programme of the Congress movement to the rule of the Indian Empire.

Considerations of this kind should weigh with the delegates at the coming meeting at Lahore. The present propaganda does not reach far enough in its educational effects. Able speeches, such as were delivered at all previous Congresses—especially at that of Allahábád in 1892—will emphasise the existence of the Indian National Movement, but no more. The circulation of the usual full and very bulky report of the proceedings among members of the Imperial Parliament will only carry on the very ineffective work usually performed by unread blue books. The work of the British Committee and the influence exercised through India come nearer to what is required in the way of working up the public mind of Great Britain on the Indian question. But all this does not bring the question home to the thought and consideration of the people of the United Kingdom. A more direct and wider propaganda is required for that purpose. Leaflets, concisely written and arranged, should be scattered among the electors. Large pamphlets or long reports will not be read in this age of crowding problems, questions, programmes, and issues. There is surfeit of political pabulum offered to the limited public appetite for political information. A leaflet, covering one plank of the Congress platform or one phase of the Indian question, consisting of one or two pages of matter only and printed in large type, is what will best answer the ends of an effective propaganda. The whole category of grievances and suggested remedies could be gone over in this way at judicious intervals. Mailed to members of Parliament, scattered at meetings and sent to clubs, associations, elections, etc., they are sure to attract attention and make the salient facts of the Indian question to be understood. Each leaflet should be headed with the words of the Act of Parliament of 1833, which declared: "That no native of the said territories (India) nor any natural born subject of His Majesty resident therein shall, by reason only of his religion, place of birth, descent, colour, or any of them, be disabled from holding any place, office, or employment under the said Government" (Act 3 and 4 Wm. IV, cap. 85, sec. 87, 1833). The failure of the expedient of the Indian Council to give more than a partial recognition to this solemn undertaking could be insisted upon, and the right of a representative system of rule for British subjects, as a substitute for this Council, affirmed.

The existing economic and fiscal evils oppressing the Indian people should be put in the foreground of this propaganda. The conditions of tenure of the rayat cultivator; how they fare under the "fixed settlement" system of Cornwallis and the extent to which it obtains; whether under the rayatwari landholding system the large proprietors and notables are checked in any way by Government in the levying of rent on tenants; how the village communities' assessment works under the middlemen Zemindari system, and how far the local authorities permit these middlemen landlords to go in their dealings with the cultivators. Also some facts about the social customs, amusements, and pastimes of the rayat population generally. All this information would be absolutely new and probably very interesting to the mass of the British people who make and unmake Parliaments, and if offered in some way like that pointed out and accompanied with the suggested native remedies for the wrongs and grievances complained of, and such remedies are found to point towards practicable reforms; Parliament would be made to reflect before long the sympathy which would be begotten in the public mind of Great Britain for the application of such remedies.

The Irish land movement has convinced the popular mind of the United Kingdom of the reason and justice of the doctrine that the tenure of land must be primarily, if not entirely, for the better remuneration of agricultural labour on live and let live principles between the land workers and the community at large. The land for the people—for the uses of labour and purposes of food production—instead of for landlord ownership and the growth of rent, is now the fixed economic faith of the industrial democracy of these islands; and all future land legislation in the Imperial Parliament is certain to proceed on lines parallel with these principles. The way will be clear therefore for the exposition of rayat grievances in the tenure and cultivation of the soil of India, and the magnitude of a problem concerning the labour of 280,000,000 of people will be a most interesting addition to the present study of the land question of the United Kingdom.

Another plank in the Congress platform which is sure to be well-received by the public is that embodied in the eighth resolution of the Allahábád meeting. The educational needs of India should be trumpeted loudly in Parliament and throughout Great Britain. Fancy a people governed by Englishmen, on presumably civilised principles, on whose education, in all forms, there is an annual expenditure at the rate of about *three pence* per head of the illiterates only among the population! Granted that 217,000,000 of such illiterates make up a large educational "order", but they are born British subjects, all the same, and they are not permitted to create their own educational require-

ments. It must also be borne in mind that Japan and China are countries in Asia also, and not under British rule, in which there is far more education than in India though the English language may not be included in such teaching. This is a huge problem closely related to the serious question of an increasing population without any corresponding increase in the area of food production. Technical instruction in better methods of cultivation is what should be principally taught in Indian schools, with model farms, adapted to the peculiar needs of the rayats, distributed throughout the provinces. The demand for a mixed Commission to enquire into the industrial resources and condition of the country is a most seasonable and practical one, taken in conjunction with the growing advocacy of technical education by educated and representative Indian opinion. The cessation of wars, the less frequency of devastating famines and of ravaging diseases must necessarily tend to make still greater the pressure of a rapidly growing population upon the present available means of subsistence for 300,000,000 people. Such a Commission for so eminently practical a purpose will have the approval of every well-wisher of India within the United Kingdom.

It cannot of course be denied that progress of a certain kind has been made in India under British rule. But Anglo-Indians inside and out of Parliament are wont to laud themselves too loudly over what has been thus accomplished. "Progress" in a country where after 150 years of British domination there are over 200,000,000 of illiterate British subjects; where the whole population taken together earn in every way an average income of only forty shillings a year per head; where 40,000,000 or perhaps many millions more, are living under conditions of semi-starvation on little more than one meal a day; and where from a population thus economically circumstanced, eight tenths of the revenue is obtained for the maintenance of this "progressive" Anglo-Indian kind of rule! But this state of things by no means exhausts the vaunted blessings of such enlightened rule. In the lowest depths there is a deeper still, and the climax of this "progress" is reached in the raising of a large portion of the revenue of the country upon an indispensable article of food for a vegetarian dieted people. This cruel Salt Tax is a far harsher burthen than a tax on bread would be for the poorest labouring portion of the working classes of Great Britain. Where are we to see in all this these boasted blessings of Anglo-Indian rule? Are they seen in the enormous annual cost of the collection of these taxes upon food and labour? Are they seen in the extraordinary step of placing upon the half-starved rayats, half the cost of the present Opium Commission, for which the people of rich England, and not those of impoverished India, clamoured so loudly? It is all very well to draw contrasts between the present and the past, but it would be an easy effort of an ordinary imagination to fancy a state of things under the Mohgul *régime* not much worse for the rayats of India than what obtains at at the present day.

Railways have been constructed for military purposes chiefly which are, however, very beneficial for more pacific and more civilised purposes. Large cities have sprung up also, and justice—even under the vicious system of uniting executive and judicial functions—is more on the side of the industrious population than when they were the prey of warring princes and dynasties. But apart from this last and common result of settled government, what is called the development of India has only benefitted the small trading and mercantile classes, a mere fraction of India's enormous population. Bombay, Calcutta, Madras, Delhi, and other smaller cities may attest this progress and prosperity which are more or less inseparable from centres of government and trade for so vast an Empire. The growth and wealth of London, Liverpool, and Glasgow has not added much to the wages of the Dorsetshire labourer or to the comforts of the Scottish crofter, or Connemara cottier; and the Anglo-Indian eulogists of their own governing virtues will find it difficult to show how Bombay's million of a population has added anything to the earnings of the rayat of Behar. The India of Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, and Delhi, is not the India which the statesman and politician of Great Britain should consider most when asked to study the Indian problem. It is the India of 80,000,000 of working rayats; of 20,000,000 artificers and mechanics; of 7,000,000 of labourers and all that depend upon them—in a word it is the India of the village communities, of the scattered industrial classes, with the yearly incomes of the whole country averaging only £2 per head of population, and who are taxed 14 per cent of this for the blessings of Anglo-Indian rule, out of which a large portion is enjoyed by foreigners and carried away clean out of the country by foreigners. It is this India, which Lord Salisbury thinks is created only to be bled by Englishmen, which should be made better known to the people of the United Kingdom, to be considered and legislated for and made more prosperous and contented if it is to be made a credit and not a reproach, a tower of strength instead of a source of weakness to the vast Empire in which it forms so large and so vitally interesting a part.

Michael Davitt.

INDIAN STUDENTS IN ENGLAND.

By Sir W. Markby, K.C.I.E.

In consequence of the suggestion that contemporaneous examinations for the Indian Civil Service should take place in England and in India, with its accompanying suggestion that those selected in India should pass some time in England, one is naturally led to reflect what advantages are to be gained for young Indians by a visit to this country, and what precautions should be taken in regard to it.

This would be best seen by considering how the youths fared who have come over here already, when they returned to their own country. I have, however, only seen those who have come to one of the universities, and I would not venture to make any general statement even with regard to these. All that I say is that I have come across some complete failures and a good many partial

ones, and it might be useful if I were to endeavour to point out what has been the cause of these unsatisfactory results.

In the first place, I think it is very often not sufficiently remembered by parents who send their sons to this country that a young native of India suddenly transferred to England finds himself of necessity in a very strange position. He is surrounded by persons whom by habit and education he is led to regard as rather superior to himself. He is expected to a large extent to adopt their dress, their manners, and their opinions, all of which are more or less unintelligible and even unsuitable to him. He is at first necessarily without friends, and has no experience to help him in the choice of his companions. His moral instinct is entirely at fault.

Has he anyone to guide him? Speaking from my own experience, I think it must be said that it is very far from certain that he will find any useful guidance. If he enters Oxford or Cambridge he will be under some sort of restraint, but it must be remembered that even here it is presumed that the students can take care of themselves, and provided they commit no breach of the very light discipline exercised by the university authorities nothing is said to them. When a lad goes wrong a good deal of trouble is usually taken to put him right. But here an Oriental is at a great disadvantage. A tutor who is endeavouring to bring round a foolish or refractory Englishman knows exactly where and how to appeal to him. But to the mind of an Oriental he is an utter stranger, and the chances are that in any interview which takes place tutor and pupil entirely fail to understand one another.

Then there is another great disadvantage which an Oriental has as compared with an English student.

An English student who comes to the university has no doubt a vast amount of opportunity of doing what is foolish. But in the great majority of cases he has to reckon not only with the university authority which is weak, but with the parental authority which is strong. And the one authority supplements the other, and is ever ready to help the other.

In the case of the Oriental, on the other hand, there is no parental authority available. It is only the weaker authority of the university which exists at all.

But more than this. Such is our university system that for six months in the year even this weak authority is for all practical purposes entirely effaced. For six months in the year the university is shut up. The English student goes home, but the Indian student goes where he likes, and he is absolutely free to do exactly what he pleases. Some use this liberty wisely, but others do not. Moreover, a young man still at the university, if he does not require restraint, at least needs advice.

So much for morals. Now as to education. It must be remembered that the universities of England are not free like the universities of Germany, but, as in the universities of India, the students have to pass certain examinations in certain prescribed subjects. These examinations are governed by rules of a very complicated kind, and at Oxford at any rate, quite unintelligible to any persons who have not been at that university; also the standard required is only known to persons who have had Oxford experience. English boys are carefully prepared at school for these examinations, up to which they are led by regular stages. In the latter examinations of the course there is a large choice of subjects—law, medicine, history, oriental literature, philosophy, Greek, Latin, etc., etc.—but in the earlier examinations the choice is very closely restricted, it being absolutely necessary to take two dead languages. Not one Indian student in twenty knows the rudiments even of one. Consequently most Indian students spend their first year in supplying this deficiency. This is in every way objectionable. The student dislikes being put back in this way in his career, and having as it were to go to school again. The machinery of an university is not adapted for teaching beginners, and every one, I think, feels that the time is wasted.

I sometimes wonder whether Indian parents ever think about these things before they send their sons to England—where they are to go, who is to look after them, whether they are able to pass their examinations in due course, what line of study will suit them best. All these are very important questions, worthy of anxious consideration. They are not easily solved. But it would, I think, be possible to devise a method by which parents might be assisted in solving them. One thing which is wanted is good and accurate information obtainable *in India*. I think this might be got, but it must be paid for handsomely. Amateurs are not of much use in these matters. But what is still more required is a *home* for students in England, whether they are attached to a university or not. This can be had, but it must be paid for at a high rate if it is to be really anything like what a home ought to be. At any rate, if I were an Indian parent, I should hesitate long before sending a lad to England to spend a considerable time there, unless I saw my way pretty clearly as to what he was going to do and where he was going to live.

I have said nothing as to how Indian students fare in London and elsewhere where there is no authority exercised over them at any time, but if report speaks truly the dangers are greater than they are here.

What I have here said is not intended to prevent Indian parents sending their sons to England. If proper care is taken this may be a great advantage. But I doubt whether at present sufficient precautions are taken to prevent what might be an advantage becoming useless, or even harmful.

Oxford, Nov., 1893. W. Markby.

THE BEHAR CADASTRAL SURVEY: FAT NEW APPOINTMENTS.

By Sir Roper Lethbridge, K.C.I.E.

The voice of the faithful *Pioneer*, always more royalist than the King when Secretariats are concerned, has for a long time been crying in the wilderness — absolutely the sole defender in the Press of the Behar Survey job. The situation was becoming trying, even for the *Pioneer's* assured

fidelity. It has despondingly talked of "judgment going by default." Consequently, its delight now knows no bounds, for Sir Charles Elliott's *locum-tenens* has taken heart of grace, and has published in the congenial pages of the *Calcutta Gazette* an apology for the Survey, which (with two rather unfortunate little postscripts from the newly appointed members of the Board of Revenue) actually fills forty-two columns of the overland *Englishman*. It is nothing to the *Pioneer* that Sir Antony MacDonnell, in this Minute, aggressively and ostentatiously throws overboard his "revered chief," Sir Charles Elliott, and defends the Survey on the ground that it will do everything Sir Charles said it would *not* do, and that it will leave undone everything Sir Charles said it would do. It is nothing to the *Pioneer* that Sir Antony simply eats his own words, published only three months ago, and written on the 6th of last July, in a calm way that, if it be a little disquieting from the point of view of the squeamish moralist, is at any rate, sublime for its barefaced audacity. It is nothing that the whole of this dreary tirade—which unfortunately will never be read through by anyone except those who are led by a particular interest in the subject to submit to such a fate—is one tissue of plausible fallacies from beginning to end, founded on authorities dexterously garbled to suit a foregone conclusion. The *Pioneer*—delighted to find that its dumb dogs have at last acknowledged that even a Lieutenant-Governor, after the lesson of the Trial by Jury agitation, cannot afford to let "judgment go by default"—calls Sir Antony's diatribes "a series of definite and damning propositions." It shoots out its tongue at those who appeal to British faith pledged to the Bengal Permanent Settlement. Holding that there is nothing more to be said when once a Lieutenant-Governor has "let himself go" in a series of "damning propositions," the *Pioneer* judges that the rest of the world must now hold their tongues, and simply watch the effect of the damning propositions on the unhappy zemindars and rayats of Behar. But, with all submission to the weighty authority of the *Pioneer*, I venture to say that the last word on this great question has by no means yet been spoken; and that there are multitudes of Europeans, both official and non-official, who know something of Bengal, who sympathise with its oppressed cultivators, and will very narrowly examine Sir Antony's damning propositions before they consent to lie still and see the zemindars and rayats quietly damned thereby.

In the November issue of India, I have already indicated, on the telegraphed summary of Sir Antony's Minute, what is really the full and sufficient reply to the whole of it. Sir Antony's new contention — gloriously contemptuous of all Sir Charles Elliott has said and written on the subject, and oblivious of what he himself, Sir Antony, has written upon it—is (1) that the Permanent Settlement was a "mistake" of Lord Cornwallis's (see § 9); (2) that the history of Bengal legislation shows that for a considerable part of the present century, the views of the zemindari party were "unduly" in the ascendant (see § 23); (3) that the zemindars have during the century greedily and illegally increased their rents, and that the rayats consequently have been and still are grievously oppressed by exorbitant rents; and (4) that the Survey will deliver the rayats from these exorbitant rents, and they can therefore well afford to pay for the maintenance of the record-of-rights, and put themselves properly at the mercy of the officials, notwithstanding the admission that "it mulcts the rayats now" (see § 69).

I think it will be admitted that the above states, not unfairly, Sir Antony's "damning propositions". On points (1) and (2) I shall, with the permission of the Editor of India, hereafter have a good deal to say. I will now content myself with mentioning, what Sir Antony and his friends know quite well, that the controversy on these points has been a "crow and owl" quarrel throughout the whole of the century; and that this Minute picks out, and states as Gospel-truths all the tit-bits on one side, from Sir John Shore down to Sir Charles Elliott, and "damns" as mistakes or "unduly" prejudiced statements all the opinions on the other side. For a really impartial view of the merits of the controversy, I need only refer the public to the able pamphlet in which Sir William Wedderburn advocates a Permanent Settlement for the whole of India; and for a just and judicial view of the status of the Bengal zemindars, to the recently published work of Mr. C. L. Tupper on "Our Indian Protectorate," pages 197-236.

But before passing on, I must refer to one particularly flagrant case of garbling in this connection. Sir Antony (§ 12) writes: "The charge is, that by recording the various rights in the soil, and maintaining the record, the Government of to-day is violating a pledge given in 1793." Now, Sir Antony must know perfectly well that this is *not* the charge—whatever other objections may be urged against the insidious project. The charge in this connection is, that the Government having in 1793 solemnly pledged itself that incomes derived from the land of Bengal should not be burdened by the future action of the Government with any greater charges than those imposed by that heavy settlement, now in 1893 imperiously announces its tyrannical intention to burden all those incomes, of rayats and of zemindars alike, not only with the ruinous cost of an unnecessary Survey, but also with all the innumerable salaries *for ever* of a monstrously-inflated and ridiculous "Land Records Establishment," as a feeding-ground for the hungry officials of the Agricultural Department.

In regard to this point, I think few will be able to suppress a smile—though it will be no laughing matter for the miserable rayats who have to find the money—when they observe, in § 62, that Sir Antony naively calls his new proposals "A Bill for the Creation and Maintenance of a Land Record Establishment!" So the *Indian Mirror*, the powerful Calcutta champion of the rayats, took the right measure of the whole of this shady business, when on July 30th last it declared plainly: "We say that this Cadastral Survey was instituted for the maintenance of the Agricultural Department, and it is iniquitous that the zemindars and rayats of Behar should be made to pay the costs of such maintenance." When this outspoken declaration was

made, the Bengal Government had not developed the gigantic scheme of new patronage and snug appointments, unfolded by this Minute of Sir Antony MacDonnell, which will fatten all the Dowbs of the Agricultural Department for all time to come!

At that time it was understood, from all that was known of the schemes of the Bengal Government, that Mr. Finucane and a few of his assistants would "boss the whole show." It was solemnly stated that they would do the whole job, once for all, for a mere song. It is true that some of us ventured to express a mild doubt whether the poor rayats would be let off for a payment of 3½ annas per acre, when we found from the Blue Book that in each District the Revenue Officer would have his swarm of "surveyors, assistant-surveyors, chainmen, and coolies, his Assistant-Settlement Officer's Peshkar, his munsarims, his mohurrirs, his peons, his clerks, his nazirs, his bench-mohurrirs, his record-keepers, his duftries, his kanungoes, and all the noble army of 'the Pindarries of Modern India.'" But anyhow, all these hungry maws were, it was then understood, to be filled once for all. After them would come the turn of the lawyers; and after the lawyers, perhaps the deluge. But now, what a phantasmagoria is unfolded before our eyes by Sir Antony MacDonnell's gorgeous scheme of "A Bill for the Creation and Maintenance of a Land Record Establishment!" Like the weird procession of the ghostly future kings in *Macbeth*, an endless array is conjured up, stretching down through the ages to come, of future Directors, and Deputy-Directors, and Assistant-Directors, and Settlement-officers, and Assistant-Settlement-officers, and Assistant-Settlement-officers' Peshkars, and in fact whole battalions, nay whole brigades, of the noble army before-mentioned!

And now let me ask in all seriousness—for it is more than a serious matter to the Behar rayats—whether, looking to the indications now given to us in this Minute of Sir Antony's of the spirit in which this brand-new "Land Record Establishment" is to be organised, I have painted this new invention of Dowb's in too strong colours. Of course the indications are, as yet, very guarded; the Viceroy, dear kind-hearted man, or the Secretary of State, might shy at this monstrous "creation" if it were introduced to his notice too abruptly—and before long Sir Antony MacDonnell himself will be on guard at Simla. But two considerations present themselves.

The first is this. Mr. Finucane, the Director of Agriculture, has blossomed out, so it appears from the heading of this Minute, into a full-blown "officiating Secretary to the Government of Bengal." Doubtless he is opportunely officiating for one of those secretaries who—notably the Hon. Mr. Cotton, well known for his sympathy with the people—so strongly protested against the whole of this new taxation. Further, it appears from the postscripts to the Minute, that the *personnel* of the Board of Revenue has been, also most opportunely, changed. One of the members, Mr. Lyall, has served during nearly the whole of his service in Eastern Bengal, and honourably mentions, in his postscript, the fact that he was only "a short time" in Behar. Oddly enough—*risum teneatis amici*—he vehemently deprecates the extension of this business, or any part of it, to Eastern Bengal; but he agrees with the Lieut.-Governor's desire that it should be imposed, even in this "wholesale way"—the phrase is not one of high praise—on North Behar. Perhaps Mr. Lyall was thinking of the very strong language, in this connexion, of his predecessors in the Board of Revenue (see Blue-book, page 153):—

> "As regards the question whether urgent need exists for the Survey, the Board desire to submit the following observations. That some uncertainty as to rents, and also as to the boundaries and areas of tenancies, prevails in Behar, must be admitted; but similar uncertainty exists everywhere, and to a greater extent in some other districts, notably Backergunge and parts of Eastern Bengal. *There appears to be far greater reasons for undertaking the Survey of Backergunge than that of any district of Behar.*"

The other member of the new Board, the Hon. Mr. Stevens, was asked in January, 1891, as Commissioner of Patna, to report on the question; and his report is printed at page 157 of the Blue-Book. He doubted the legality of some of the proposals of the Government, and the wisdom of others; and altogether declined to accept Mr. Finucane's sanguine expectations as to the low cost. But the report was not so utterly condemnatory as most of the others received—for of one district, Muzaffarpore, that had already been partially surveyed as an experiment, he said: "I know of no reason why the survey of the Muzaffarpore district should not proceed." And in regard to the rest of the division, he said: "When the legal point has been settled, assuming it to be decided in Mr. Finucane's favour, I think it will be an excellent plan to try the scheme in Bettiah as he recommends. It follows, of course, that if successful there, it should be extended to other localities, unless some reason to the contrary clearly appears." The worst opponents of the Survey would hardly object to this mild proposition. Still, it appears to have been sufficiently gushing for Sir Charles Elliott or Sir Antony MacDonnell (I don't know who made the promotion) to discover in it the accents of his long-lost (official) brother. Mr. Stevens has become a member of the Board of Revenue, and his postscript and Mr. Lyall's—though they are throughout utterly at variance with each other—enabled it to be telegraphed to the *Times* that "the Board of Revenue endorsed Sir Antony MacDonnell's Minute," though the reports of the old Board of Revenue, printed in the Blue Book, had condemned the whole business in unmeasured terms. Now, this wholesale change in the *personnel* in the highest offices of the Bengal Government appears to show that that Government will go a long way to make its Survey policy a success.

And the second consideration is this. It seems, from § 73 A. of Sir Antony MacDonnell's Minute, that the indigo-planters of Behar, though with regard to the Survey they thought that "a very much larger proportion, if not the whole of the costs, should be borne by the Government," had not such a strong objection to the future tax on posterity for the maintenance of the record of rights, provided it be controlled by European officers of the Survey Department in each district. In § 73 B., Sir Antony

expresses the opinion that these are merely "matters of detail which are susceptible of adjustment," and adds:

"I have since communicated these proposals to Sir William Hudson, President of the Indigo Planters Association, who now authorises me to say that, while endorsing Mr. Macnaghten's remarks, he accepts my scheme for maintaining the record, subject to the condition that a European officer of the Survey Department with the powers of a Deputy Collector (*i.e.*, of a Revenue Officer) be appointed to supervise the working of the scheme *in each district*. Compliance with Sir William Hudson's condition is consistent with my scheme."

Now that is the lordly spirit in which to deal with the spending of other people's money! No more of the petty haggling as to whether you should employ patwâris on 10 Rs. a month, or kanungoes on 20 Rs. With a stroke of the pen we conciliate opposition by decreeing that there shall be a European land-record officer *in each district*, with the rank (and pay, ahem!) and establishment of a deputy-collector; and, my word!, what real jam for Dowb, when there is a land-record establishment of this calibre in every district of the Lower Provinces! No more need for civilians, or for planters either, to be writing dismal letters to the papers, asking "What are we to do with our sons?" Sir Antony MacDonnell's large mind is equal to supplying everyone with a *carrière ouverte aux talents*, at the expense of the rayats and zemindars of Bengal.

Here then comes in, in sober earnestness, a good bit of that phantasmagoria of future fat appointments of which I have spoken.

But these are the mere "matters of detail" of which Sir Antony talks in so airy a manner. The great object which lies so near the Lieutenant-Governor's heart, when he forces the zemindars and rayats to endow this magnificent department out of their superabundant means, is the lowering of the poor rayats' rents that, we are *now* told, is to result from the Survey and the maintenance of the record. Well, but—if this is anything better than a shabby and most audacious change of front, in the hope of averting certain defeat on the other line of tactics—how does Sir Antony harmonise this belief with his own words, signed by Mr. Risley on the 6th of last July? They are so striking and so convincing that I must quote them once more:—

"By the Survey and record the landlords will gain substantially, not only in that the recovery of existing rents will be materially facilitated and its cost reduced, but by the increase of rents in cases where the Survey enables the landlord to prove that the tenant is holding land in excess of the area for which he is paying rent. In a very large proportion of the holdings in the Bettiah Raj, it is believed that such enhancement will be feasible; and although it is hoped that the manager will not take advantage of the Survey to attempt a general raising of rents on this ground, it can hardly be doubted that the fact that he holds this power in reserve will tell in favour of the Raj in any question that may arise between it and its tenants. The presumption in favour of existing rents created by section 104 (3) carries with it the consequence, that if there be a variation of the rent, it must be in the direction of an enhancement—unless power is given under Section 112 of Act to reduce rent (a power which it is invidious to exercise if it can be avoided, and for which the officiating Lieutenant-Governor does not now ask). The experience already acquired in the settlement of Wards' and private estates under the Act shows that on the average, the zemindars may count upon realising a return of from 12 to 15 per cent. on the expenditure incurred. *Regarded therefore as a mere investment, the making of a Survey and record-of-rights is a source of substantial profit to the landlords.* . . . . So far, then looking at the matter from the rayat's point of view, it will be seen that for a Survey and record *which will lead probably to an enhancement of their rents*, and certainly to a curtailment of the area within which the rights conferred on them by the Tenancy Act can take effect, the rayats will have to pay a sum amounting in the aggregate to one-half of the charges imposed upon the land."

How does Sir Antony reconcile his new theory of the reduction of rents by the Survey, with the letter of the Board of Revenue of May 28th, 1891:—

"The Board think it probable that the grounds for reduction would be established in far fewer cases than those for enhancement. . . . . The possibility of an enhancement of rent is, in the Board's opinion, a factor of great importance in the consideration of the present question. To the cost which would fall on the rayats on account of the Survey, and the incidental expenditure in stamps and legal advisers' fees, might thus be added in many cases a permanent charge on account of increased rents."

How does he reconcile it with Sir Charles Elliott's statement, printed at page 148 of the Blue-book, that "the parties should pay according to the benefits to be received," and that "as a general rule the Lieutenant-Governor would propose that the cost should be equally divided between the zemindars and the rayats."! Was this, were the many references made by Sir Charles Elliott to the enhancements of rent accruing to the zemindars from the experimental surveys, nothing more than so much dust thrown into the zemindars' eyes? No one will believe this, and it will be interesting to know what Sir Charles Elliott has to say to this new departure.

Once more. Sir Antony, in § 41, declares that the Bengal Government, when insisting on the "receipt" arrangement in the Tenancy Bill, did not trust it as a safeguard for the rayats, but "pinned its faith as regards Behar especially to the record-of-rights." This statement is in direct conflict with Mr. Ilbert's "Statement of Objects and Reasons" for the Tenancy Bill. But this point must be reserved for a future article.

Roper Lethbridge.

THE SEPARATION OF EXECUTIVE AND JUDICIAL SERVICES IN BARODA.

By K. V. Sarangpani, B.A., LL.B.
District Judge, Baroda.

I have read with much interest the able communications on the subject of the separation of executive and judicial functions in general, by Sir Richard Garth, and the scheme proposed by Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt, which have been published in your issues of India. The stock argument that the weight and influence of the Revenue Department will receive a blow if the executive officers are divested of magisterial powers has been fairly examined in all its aspects, and it is found that it cannot stand the light of fair controversy. So far as the principle of separation is concerned I do not think there can be two opinions about it.

The question that has been occupying the attention of those who are concerned with it is how effect

can be given to the principle consistently with less cost to government. Mr. Dutt has, in his scheme about the Bengal Presidency, proposed that the young civilians who come out fresh from England should be entrusted with purely revenue, executive, and police work, that in each district one half of the deputy magistrates should be employed on purely executive and revenue work and the other half on purely judicial work, and wound up with a suggestion that twenty or thirty sub-deputy collectors would have to be appointed in order to effect a complete separation between executive and judicial functions. His Highness the Mahárájá Gaikwad of Baroda, who has received education of the highest order among the ruling princes in India, and who has introduced many reforms consistently with the requirements of his subjects, has already taken a lead in the matter, and given effect to a scheme which has for its end the separation of the judicial and executive functions, and which has been in force for about the last three years.

I have had the honour of holding in this State for about the last ten years a District Judge's post—a post where I have ample opportunities to watch the working of the scheme. As several able and experienced officers and jurists, in and out of authority, have been devoting their attention to the discussion of this question, I should consider it as not quite out of place and uninteresting if I gave my own experiences of the new measure introduced, with the past history of the old state of things.

The Baroda State is divided into four districts, otherwised called "Prànts." Those four districts are sub-divided into Talukas, generally according to their population and area. Each district has got two chief officers—the Subha, *i.e.*, the Collector, and the Prânt Nyayadhisha, *i.e.*, the District Judge. The work of the former is more varied. He has multifarious duties to discharge. He exercises control over the police, looks after gaols, supervises the collection of revenue, superintends the abkari, Customs, and opium departments, sees that roads, trees, and buildings are in good order, and performs a number of other duties. The District Judge is the head of the munsiffs, *i.e.*, sub-judges, who work under him, and tries serious criminal cases committed to him by magistrates. By way of differentiation, it may be briefly said that, excluding the civil branch in the sense in which it is generally understood, the subha is all in all in a district.

The subha has got under him naib-subhas, *i.e.*, assistant or deputy collectors, who are generally entrusted with the charge of two or three talukas, according as they are large or small. Each subha has generally one naib-subha to assist him, mainly in the supervision of accounts in the district. The business of a naib-subha is to make jamabandi, to supervise the work of wahiwatdars, *i.e.*, mamlutdars of the talukas that are in his charge, and to assist the subha in the disposal of important questions pertaining to other matters. The duty of a wahiwatdar is primarily to collect revenue. Each wahiwatdar has got an aval (head) karkun under him to assist him in the collection of revenue and the supervision of accounts of the taluka. Thus, so far as the executive powers are concerned, a subha is the head of a district and a wahiwatdar of a taluka, a naib-sabha holding an intermediate position between the two.

As regards criminal functions, a subha has powers co-ordinate with those of a sessions judge, a naib-subha generally a first-class magistrate's, a wahiwatdar a second-class magistrate's, and an aval-karkun a third-class magistrate's powers.

When the administration of the Baroda State was re-modelled during the minority of His Highness the Mahárájá, a subha combined in himself the powers of a sessions judge, although each district had a separate prânt nyayadhisha. He received all sessions cases. All criminal appeals were, in the first instance, lodged before him. It then rested with a subha to send almost all sessions cases and a few criminal appeals for disposal to a district judge. It was subsequently found that if a subha transferred almost all the sessions cases to a district judge, their formal commitment to the former was unnecessary. The practice was discontinued, and all the sessions cases then came up directly to a district judge. It was also found that pleaders and parties had often to go out to out-of-the-way corners of a district inaccessible by easy journey to file criminal appeals, and to dance attendance upon the authorities, to remain present at the hearing of appeals. The inconvenience of the arrangement was felt, and it was ruled that all criminal appeals should be filed before a district judge. At present a subha retains the powers of a sessions judge, admits appeals only in possession cases, and exercises general supervision over the magistrates in a district. In him the powers of a sessions judge are simply nominal, since occasions to exercise them are few and far between, and only arise when there is no proper person to take up sessions cases. He retains, as above said, the power of admitting and hearing appeals in possession cases, because he is considered to be more conversant with questions relating to land disputes. From what experience I have of these appeals, I can say almost with confidence that there are indeed few cases in which knotty problems requiring such special knowledge of land questions as a subha is thought to possess, spring up. I am of opinion that a district judge may safely be entrusted with the work of the hearing of these appeals. Now that the Possession Act is on the Legislative anvil, an appeal against decisions in possession cases may perhaps be dispensed with. A subha will then have left to him power of general supervision over magistrates in his district. Practically a district judge exercises this power, as a subha, with the manifold duties he has to discharge, has hardly any leisure left to him to attend to it. As the retention of power in dual authorities is, as I understand, objectionable on principle, although no perceptible harm has come out of it, and as a district judge can go out in his district on inspection duty, he may alone be left unfettered to exercise that power.

Experience showed that divisional magistrates or the naib subhas, wahiwatdars, and aval karkun, with the varied executive duties they have to perform, could not dispense justice to rayats with promptness. Posts of special magistrates have, therefore, been newly created in each district, and

men with legal qualifications have been appointed to them. These appointments have, at present, been distributed according to the needs and requirements of each district. These magistrates are invested with the powers of a first-class magistrate. They try all criminal cases ranging from the jurisdiction of a third-class magistrate to that of a first-class one. They have charge of two, three, or sometimes four talukas, according as they are small or large. In order to obviate the inconvenience arising to people coming from long distances, theymove out every week to each taluka station to try criminal cases of that taluka. They thus combine in themselves the advantages of circuit magistrates. They also sit with wahiwatdars to try cases by summary trial. The procedure of summary trial has been recently introduced in this State, and it is deemed unsafe, and I should think rightly, at the outset to invest a single person with that power. The executive officials are not divested of their criminal powers, but they only exercise them during the absence of special magistrates, or on special occasions.

The creation of the posts of these special magistrates has been under trial during the last three years. The scheme has worked well and, to my experience, justice is being dealt out to people with diligence and despatch, without there being any instances of substantial failure of justice. In this arrangement there is one thing which needs to be guarded against, and it is the nomination of unqualified men to magistrates' posts. With this precaution the scheme may be expected to work well. Care should also, I think, be taken to make a proper allotment of special magistrates to each district.

These appointments of special magistrates in each district have, no doubt, entailed additional cost on the State, but, as things stand at present, no scheme can be devised which can have for its object the separation of executive and judicial functions, and in which no additional expenditure will have to be incurred. As the burden of magisterial functions has been removed from the shoulders of naib subhas, wahiwatdars, and aval karkuns, it may perhaps, in course of time, be deemed expedient to reduce their number. The saving thus effected would go to recoup, to a certain extent, the additional expenditure which is at present being incurred by H. H.'s Government on account of these special magistrates.

It will thus be seen that the scheme, certainly capable of some further improvements, and similar to the one proposed by Mr. Dutt, has been in operation already in this State, and has been working satisfactorily.

Baroda. K. V. Sarangpani.

THE INDIAN CENSUS.

Mr. E. O. Walker, C.I.E., late Superintendent of Telegraphs in India, writes: With reference to the interesting article by Mr. Morse Stephens in the November issue on this subject, I should like to invite a closer scrutiny of the figures of the census, from which some instructive deductions may be drawn, and to which it does not seem to have occurred to writers in England to give prominence. Many people think that populous districts in Bengal have reached the limit, as regards diversity, at which they can support the people, but it will be seen that the productiveness of the soil is such as to admit of the increased population in the ten years now reviewed being provided for. The figures per square mile for the years 1881 and 1891 respectively are as follows: Puhna District, 689 and 741; Dacca, 713 and 865; Mozufferpur, 825 and 912; Sarun, 843 and 930; and Putna, 705 and 852. These are among the densest districts, and, judging from the numbers, it would not appear that there was much immigration from them, as the increase is if anything rather above the average for the whole country.

As regards the increase in prosperity of the country at large, the fact that the numbers of workers in gold, silver, and precious stones has increased from 472,956 to 1,783,874 in ten years is instructive. Attributable to the direct influence of Europe is the fact that the number of persons concerned in the manufacture of cotton, hemp, and jute, etc., has increased from 5,758,551 to 9,281,159; of iron and steel, from 473,361 to 1,572,911; of machinery, from 62,074 to 173,593; of watches and instruments, from 3,020 to 11,638; of chemicals, from 81,033 to 200,117; persons employed in medicine, from 188,500 to 514,074; in law, from 31,628 to 226,163; in literature, from 35,700 to 280,705; and in education, from 170,701 to 486,497. In fact, over one quarter of the increased population since 1881 has found occupations in modern industries, fine arts, and learned professions; and the ratio of the number so employed in 1891 to that of 1881 is such as to warrant the supposition that in the next thirty years work in these directions will be sufficient to employ the whole of the yet unborn generation. The idea that the country cannot support the population as it is growing at present, if it be properly developed, is absurd. Last year Bombay alone exported 450,000 tons of wheat, enough to feed half the persons born that year in India, and this, it must be remembered, is a comparatively new trade. India's strength lies in her agricultural resources, and when she is fully able to turn out her manufactured goods in sufficient quantity to supply her own wants, she will be in a unique position. We know that an enormous number of the people are in miserable poverty at present. Taxation must be reduced, and legislation must secure to the people a due share of profit on what they produce.

Now how have the mass of the people been faring in the ten years under review? I think the figures give a gleam of hope that their condition is improving. The number of children who have lived to reach the age of ten years has increased at a rate rather higher than was naturally to be expected from increase of population. Infant life would seem to be better cared for. Infirmities, such as are enumerated (insanity, deafmutism, blindness, and leprosy), have decidedly decreased. As regards education, although the numbers of persons under instruction show only such an increase as is proportionate to the general rate of increase of population, yet the number of persons who could read and write was fifty per cent. greater in 1891 than it was in 1881.

"INDIA, PAST AND PRESENT."

This was the title of an address which Lord Roberts delivered in Dundee on November 22nd. In the first portion of the address his lordship sketched the rise and expansion of British rule in the East and the course of events which led to the Mutiny. That outbreak, in his opinion, greatly accelerated the marvellous changes which had taken place in India during the latter half of the century. The chief interest of this review lay in the references to the approach of Russia :—

"So long ago as 1837 (when Lord Auckland was governing India) the Shah of Persia advanced claims to the western districts of Afghanistan, and the Afghan Amir, failing to obtain assistance from the Government of India, entered into negociations with Russia—a significant fact when we remember that at that time the nearest Russian troops were at Orenburg, distant about 1,500 miles from Cabul, while Orenburg was 900 miles from its base, Moscow, with which it was not, of course, connected by railway, as it has been for the last seventeen years. The home Government was alive even then to the fact that the independence and integrity of Afghanistan are essential to the security of India, and it was determined to conclude a treaty with Runjeet Sing, the ruler of the Punjab, for the purpose of reinstating Shah Shooja on the Afghan throne. Shah Shooja was the legitimate descendant of Ahmed Shah Abdali, the Saduzi, and thirty years before had sought a refuge in our territory to escape from the vengeance of the Barakzai usurper, Dost Muhammad Khan, the grandfather of the present Amir of Afghanistan. The object in view was effected without difficulty, and for two years British and native troops occupied the country round Cabul and Candahar. Owing, however, to the length and difficulty of our communications, and to the jealous and obstructive attitude of the Sikhs, who interposed between our base and our field army; owing also to political blunders and military incapacity, and last, but not least, to the inability of native soldiers drawn from Bengal and Southern India to withstand the hardships of a rigorous Northern climate, or to cope with the more martial and hardy races which inhabit the trans-Indus uplands, the British force was destroyed in its retreat from Cabul; and although we subsequently re-captured that city in the autumn of 1842, we eventually evacuated the country, and abandoned for the time an enterprise the difficulties of which were so considerable as to almost ensure its failure."

Lord Roberts dealt at some length with the circumstances which prepared the way for the Mutiny in 1857, and glanced at the consequent changes in the government of the country and the condition of the people. He then dealt with the question of the defence of India, "the enemy," of course, being Russia:

"There are three dangers to which our Indian Empire is exposed. First, the danger of our line of communication between it and the United Kingdom being interrupted. Our safeguard against this danger is our naval supremacy. The second danger is that of internal disaffection. This can best be guarded against—(*a*) By a sufficiency of British soldiers; (*b*) by defensive precautions, more particularly in the matter of interior communications; (*c*) by a properly organised native army; (*d*) by a system of promotion in the civil and military administration which will ensure men of resolution, insight, and activity being selected for the more important posts; and, last but not least, (*e*) by doing all in our power to gain the confidence of the people, and to imbue them with a belief in our will and ability to maintain our supremacy in India. The third danger is that of intrigue or open aggression on the north-west of India, and against this the only protection is a friendly, but at the same time determined and consistent, policy in our dealings with Afghanistan, a well-disciplined and mobile army in India, and a home army capable of supplying the reinforcements of British troops which India would require in the event of war. If our foreign policy in India and at home is timid and vacillating; if we alternately advance and retire without any preconceived idea of what we want and of the best way of attaining it; if the British army is incapable of meeting the requirements of national defence at home and abroad, our hold on India must be of a precarious nature, and, owing to the neglect of reasonable precautions, we may find ourselves involved in a costly struggle in order to regain what we need never have lost. The whole history of our connection with India confirms the truth of these remarks."

In conclusion Lord Roberts said: "I have long and deeply studied how best to defend the British empire in India against the three dangers to which it is exposed—the maritime, the internal, and the frontier danger; and I have such a belief in the intelligence and common sense of my countrymen that I feel confident they will arrive at a sound conclusion if only they will make themselves acquainted with our actual position as an Eastern Power, and duly appreciate the lessons which may be gathered from past history and experience. The British nation will, I trust, perceive how vitally its own prosperity is bound up with the maintenance of our supremacy in India and the extension of our trade with the East, and will consequently insist on the navy being strong enough to protect our interests and commerce; on the army at home and abroad being trained, organised, and equipped in readiness for the duties it may be called upon to perform; and, last but not least, on the Central Asian question being dealt with in a firm and consistent manner."

THE NEW VICEROY.

Discussing the appointment of Lord Elgin to the Viceroyalty of India, the writer on "Indian Affairs" in the *Times* said recently:—"The appointment of Lord Elgin to the Viceroyalty has formed the Indian topic of the fortnight. The telegrams indicate that public opinion in India regards the change from Sir

Henry Norman, notwithstanding the many high qualities of that veteran soldier-administrator, with something like a feeling of relief. On the other hand, it is not without anxiety that the Indian Press, European and native, receives, at this particular juncture, the news of the nomination of a Viceroy whose sole recommendations are, so far as the public knows, a great name and a blameless private life. There never was a time when larger issues lay before an incoming Viceroy of India. Lord Lansdowne unavoidably leaves a legacy of difficult questions to his successor. Apart from frontier politics, on which it would be unpatriotic to enter pending the conclusion of the present mission to Cabul, and apart from the financial deadlock threatened by philanthropists in this country whose intensity of conviction against the opium revenue outruns their knowledge of the facts, there are constitutional problems of the first magnitude which the new Viceroy will be called upon peremtorily to solve. He will have to bring into practical working order the expanded Legislative Councils, as reconstructed under Lord Cross's Act of 1892. He will have to face the eventual consequences of an artificially appreciated currency, and of the closing of the Indian mints in 1893. He will, in every period of financial strain, find himself compelled to fall back on one of the most unpopular and most unequal of imposts, the salt-tax, by the prohibition against Indian import duties laid upon him in the interests of the British manufacturers. There is a coming conflict between the interests of the industrial classes in India and in England which may, perhaps, develop into an acute stage during the next five years. Meanwhile there is a skilfully-organised agitation for political rights and elective institutions in India, which he must deal with, not only in the interests of the comparatively small, although deservedly influential, classes who make these demands, but also in the interests of the Indian population as a whole. At the same time there is at home an increasing inclination of Parliament to assert a more direct control over Indian affairs—a control which may perhaps in the long run be beneficial to India, but which certainly requires firmness and tact on the part of an Indian Viceroy to withstand its frequent vagaries.

But if the new Viceroy will have to deal with questions of great difficulty and magnitude, he has one consolation to start with. There is no high office under the Crown of which the incumbent, if he will resolutely give up his own ease and comfort to the hard task of learning his duties, is more ably assisted in finding out what is right, or more loyally supported in doing it. Lord Elgin's lineage will render him a *persona grata* to the feudatory Princes of India. The much-lamented death of his father while second Viceroy of India secures for him at starting a place in the affections of the native population of the British provinces. Among Anglo-Indians it is a matter of patriotism that every Viceroy, from whatever political party he may come, should prove a success. All classes, European and native alike, remember that the Viceroy least distinguished for previous services in England proved himself the wisest, the firmest, and at the same time the most popular ruler that India has received since the country passed to the Crown. If Lord Elgin can write on his blank shield a record like that which Lord Mayo left inscribed on his, or win a place in Indian history such as Lord Mayo won. India will, indeed be fortunate. The main secret of success of an Indian Viceroy is a determined sacrifice of self and leisure and personal inclination from the day he takes up to the day he lays down the exhausting office."

Reviews.

By H. Morse Stephens, M.A.

LORD AUCKLAND.

The Earl of Auckland and the First Afghan War. By Captain L. J. Trotter. (*Rulers of India Series.* Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. Price 2s. 6d.)

It would be hard to write an interesting book about Lord Auckland. His name in Indian history is coupled with the disasters of the first Afghan War. He is universally considered the feeblest Governor-General who ever ruled India. He was himself an uninteresting man, and no great deeds made his government of India conspicuous. Lord Ellenborough, his successor, may have been wrong-headed and theatrical, but he was at any rate a man of great ability and marked individuality. Lord Hardinge was not a great man, but during his rule the first struggle with the Sikhs was fought out. Lord William Bentinck was not a man of genius, but his rule was marked by some of the most momentous reforms ever accomplished in India. Against even the weakest of his predecessors and successors Lord Auckland cuts but a sorry figure. It is a poor excuse for him to urge that he was swayed by his private secretary Mr. J. R. Colvin. Great rulers are the masters not the servants of their secretaries. If ever the lives of the private secretaries of the Governors-General and Viceroys of India should be written in a series of volumes it would be curious to note how the greater the ruler the more accomplished and able was his private secretary. What Wellesley owed to Colonel William Kirkpatrick will never be known now, for Wellesley contrived always to fill the centre of the stage to the exclusion of his subordinates. Tradition says that no English ruler of India was ever so completely governed by his secretary as Lord Auckland was by the able and imperious man who ended his days so sadly within the fort of Agra in 1857.

With such a subject Captain Trotter must have found it difficult to attain the enthusiasm of the biographer. Sir William Hunter cannot be blamed for including Lord Auckland in his series. There would have been a marked gap otherwise between the lives of Lord William Bentinck and Lord Hardinge. As for Captain Trotter he has already had the privilege of writing the life of the first, and in some respects the greatest of all the Governors-General, Warren Hastings, so that he cannot complain if he has also had assigned to him the life of the feeblest. But in spite of the unattractiveness of

the subject we cannot think that Captain Trotter has made the most of it. Something like 180 pages out of 216 are devoted to the events of the first Afghan war which are carefully described from the inception of the mistaken policy of passing beyond the Indus to the conclusion of the war during the rule of Lord Ellenborough. In fact, Captain Trotter has rather written a short history of the first Afghan war than a life of Lord Auckland. That he has written it competently is only to be expected from such a veteran Anglo-Indian author. But he has added nothing to our knowledge and very little to our understanding of the course of events. He has had access to no documents that are not already known, but he seems to have studied most of the printed literature upon the subject. This terrible lack of proportion kills the merit of the book whether as a biography of Lord Auckland or as a history of India under Lord Auckland. We cannot but think that more might have been made of the events in Oudh, Satára, Gwalior, Indore, Karnúl, and Haidarábád, which Captain Trotter summarises in the ten pages of his third chapter; that more might have been said of the development of the internal administration; and that some interesting extracts might have been made from that charming book, "Up the Country," by the Hon. Eleanor Eden, which so vividly describes the life of a Governor-General of India fifty years ago.

The name of Eden is so distinguished in English politics that one cannot but regret the failure of the second holder of the title of Auckland to rival the fame of his father. The first Lord Auckland was not only the ablest coadjutor of the younger Pitt, but also his personal friend. It was the first Lord Auckland who, as Mr. Eden, negotiated the commercial treaty with France, which is one of the greatest memorials of the genius of Pitt. In situations of difficulty Pitt continually turned to his friend's assistance, and it was commonly reported in the gossip of the time that the great English minister was only prevented from marrying one of Lord Auckland's daughters by a belief that it was his duty as a statesman to remain unmarried. Like Pitt himself the first Lord Auckland was a disciple of Adam Smith, and he did much to introduce enlightened views into English social and commercial politics. It was thanks to the glamour of his father's ability that the second Lord Auckland was appointed President of the Board of Trade and Master of the Mint, in Lord Grey's Reformed Cabinet, and was afterwards chosen for the high office of Governor-General of India. He was not a tried statesman like most of his predecessors and successors, but it was believed that he had inherited something of his father's administrative and diplomatic ability, and that he would therefore continue the peace policy of Lord William Bentinck. He proved himself, on the contrary, an ardent partizan of war, and under the influence of Macnaghten and Colvin brought about the disastrous and utterly unnecessary Afghan war. By that war his reputation as a statesman was blasted, and in determining his position in English history it holds a place similar to that which the commercial treaty with France holds in determining his father's position. His failure in the Afghan war associates the second Lord Auckland with disgrace, just as the Commercial Treaty with France crowns his father with success.

THE FRENCH IN INDIA.

History of the French in India from the Founding of Pondichery in 1674 *to the Capture of that place in* 1761. By COLONEL G. B. MALLESON, C.S.I. New edition carefully compared and revised. (London: W. H. Allen and Co. Price 16s.)

COLONEL MALLESON is a recognised authority on modern Indian history. He is the most voluminous contemporary writer upon his subject, and his merits as well as his defects are universally admitted whenever Indian history is studied. Of all his numerous works his "History of the French in India" has the highest reputation. Yet it is far from being his best work. His "History of the Indian Mutiny" gives evidence of more diligent study and more careful collation of authorities. Both his big and his little book on Clive are written with more assured knowledge and with more practised literary skill. His "Historical Sketch of the Native States of India" and his "History of Afghanistan," though not so well known, are more finished pieces of work. His "History of the French in India" of which he has just published a new edition, was a comparatively early work, and was first issued in 1867. It has all the defects and advantages of an early work. It is full of enthusiasm and of the bright vividness which is apt to disappear in the later works of a copious writer. Practice in literature as in everything else has its disadvantages, and though an author gains facility and finish as a literary workman he often loses the primal freshness of his style. Further when Colonel Malleson wrote his "History of the French in India" he was not the trained expert in judging the evidence of historical material that he has since become. The labour involved in the compilation of his "History of the Mutiny" has made him more diligent in collecting material and more skilful in appreciating it than he used to be when he was still in harness in India. It would be too hard to judge his early and his later work by the same standard. An official in India has not the same opportunities and leisure for research that a retired officer has in Europe. It is to be wished therefore that Colonel Malleson had never written upon the French in India in his earlier days, because in that case he would have attacked the subject *de novo* with the skill of a practised historian instead of merely revising his former work. It is a great temptation to an author in bringing out a new edition of a book which has won its way to popularity to follow the lines he formerly took too closely, instead of mastering the whole subject afresh.

The fault which is patent on a study of Col. Malleson's new edition is that he has not brought his knowledge of the subject up to date. The reason for this fault has been indicated. He has not studied the new material which has become accessible since the publication of his first edition.

In his notes he repeatedly quotes the authorities which were standard in 1867, but nowhere does he quote or refer to French writers who have written on the subject since that date. He might be excused perhaps for neglecting the recent Lives of Dupleix by Hamont and Bionne, which are to some extent founded on his own book, though in both of them he would have discovered valuable new lights and fresh information, but his neglect of such recent workers as Bonassieux, and above all Castonnet des Fosses seriously depreciates the value of his new edition. It may be that Col. Malleson is in reality acquainted with all these books, but in that case he merits severe condemnation for making no mention of them and for invariably quoting earlier authorities. He has lost a great opportunity in not bringing his volume thoroughly up to date and now runs the risk of seeing some rival arise in one of his favourite departments of historical research. He cannot be surprised since he has lost the chance afforded him by this new edition to make his work thoroughly complete, if a new writer, after studying recent authorities and working among the original documents in Paris should seek to supersede him.

The story which Col. Malleson tells is well worth the reading. Once again the merits of those great Frenchmen Benoit, Dumas, Dupleix, and Bussy are brought into prominence. Once again it is made clear that they devised the way by which the English afterwards became the masters of India. Once again the blind folly of the French Government in failing to support its sons in the East appears in marked contrast to the patriotic genius of Pitt. The story of the rise of the French power in India and its speedy decline is one of the most dramatic in history. Again and again the French were within an ace of expelling the English; again and again the gods seemed to fight against them. The fatality which followed the well-combined schemes of Dupleix reads like the lessons of a Greek tragedy. Unexpected chances of success were given to him only to be snatched away, and the final triumph of England was due more to the evil destiny of France than even to the valour of Clive and Lawrence. It has been said that a practised author loses something of his primal freshness. Perhaps that is the reason that Col. Malleson's narrative of the exploits of the French in India seems so much more vivacious than his narrative of the horrors and campaigns of the Indian Mutiny. But everything has its compensation. If the "History of the French in India" is more brightly written than the "History of the Indian Mutiny" it does not show the same solid judgment or thorough mastery of details. However it is Col. Malleson's own books which lend themselves to this comparison, for there is no other author at present writing on the history of India in the last century with whom to compare him. It is sincerely to be hoped, however, that he will not be tempted to write too much, and that in later editions of his other books he will take more careful note of new material than he has in this second edition of his "French in India".

THE PORTUGUESE IN INDIA.

Report on the Portuguese Records Relating to the East Indies, contained in the Archivo Da Torre Do Tombo and the Public Libraries at Lisbon and Evora. By F. C. Danvers. (Published by order of the Secretary of State for India in Council.)

Portuguese Discoveries, Dependencies, and Missions in Asia and Africa. By the Rev. Alex. J. D'Orsey. (London: W. H. Allen and Co. Price 7s. 6d.)

If a contrast between the methods of superficial historical writers and trained historians were needed to illustrate the advantages of the modern method of working upon documentary evidence only and the disadvantages of the old vicious school of writing so-called history, it could be afforded by the perusal of the two volumes which form the subjects of this review. Mr. Danvers, the accomplished and able Superintendent of Records at the India Office, has been to Portugal in order to examine the documents preserved there relating to the history of the Portuguese in India. He has reaped a rich harvest, and has contributed a report of the very greatest historical value. It is not too much to say that he has provided materials for the first time for a real history of the decline of the Portuguese power in India. No historian, whether of India or of Portugal, can for the future avoid expressing his obligations to Mr. Danvers. He has not only provided new material, but he has shown future investigators the nature of the mine of documentary wealth which still waits to be examined in Portugal. He has not attempted to write a history, though the extent of his knowledge and the novelty of his material would well have justified him in so doing. He has modestly confined himself to indicating sources of information, and has not endeavoured to throw his results into literary form. His ambition evidently is to take a place, which will be an honourable one, among the modest students who labour rather to aid future historians than to earn a reputation for themselves. Only experts can appreciate the great service that Mr. Danvers has rendered to the cause of history, and he will have to be satisfied with their heartfelt gratitude, for his report is not likely to achieve a popular success. In every respect Mr. Danvers stands poles apart from Mr. D'Orsey. The latter has merely gone over well-known printed books, and hashed up the results of his reading in a pretentious shape. Not only is there not a single fragment of new information to be discovered in Mr. D'Orsey's pages, but he has also omitted to avail himself even of the current literature of his subject. In every way he contrasts, and contrasts badly, with Mr. Danvers. Whereas Mr. Danvers is almost too modest and leaves the merit of the work he has done to be discovered by the few who can appreciate it, Mr. D'Orsey makes a fulsome parade of his diligence, and seems to call aloud for popularity. It is hardly fair to Mr. Danvers to review his valuable report in the same article with Mr. D'Orsey's third-rate book. But the temptation to draw a contrast between their respective methods is too strong to be resisted, and a comparison between them affords a valuable object-lesson for the exposition of the old and new methods of studying history.

Mr. Danvers has adopted a method not unlike

that pursued in the English series of the Calendars of State Papers. He has classified the documents he inspected in Portugal and given a brief extract of the more important among them. He has enriched his Report with valuable notes from other sources, and has illustrated the whole with a most valuable map, in which an attempt is made to identify many of the places mentioned in the old records. Mr. Danvers would be the first to admit that his work has not been exhaustive. It serves rather as a sign-post to direct future students and as a beacon to indicate in what directions important discoveries may yet be made. In one point especially Mr. Danvers has shown a true historical sense. He has not attempted to throw more light on the heroic period of the Portuguese in India. The exploits of Albuquerque and the greatest of his predecessors and successors have been carefully yet eloquently described by contemporary Portuguese historians. Portugal's great age as a warrior nation was also her great literary age and the Portuguese conquistadors found worthy chroniclers of their deeds of arms among their own generation. De Barros, Cantanheda, and Correa were truly admirable historians, dealing with a mass of documents and speaking of a time of heroes whom they well knew. There is little to be gleaned in the Portuguese archives according to Mr. Danvers about the establishment of the Portuguese power in Asia. That record was nobly written by the Portuguese writers of the 16th century who have left little to be desired in the way of thoroughness or accuracy. But for the period of the decline of the Portuguese power there are but few authorities, for the 17th and 18th centuries did not present much that was pleasing to patriotic Portuguese writers. Portuguese literature rather took the line of poetry than of history, and with the national greatness the desire to paint the national story disappeared. It is upon this period that Mr. Danvers has mainly worked. Documents are abundant, but they have hitherto been sadly neglected. Yet it is upon this period of the decline of the Portuguese in India that the attention of Englishmen is naturally revitted. For the same period which witnessed the decay of the empire of Albuquerque saw also the growth of the power of the London East India Company. In the days when the great Portuguese historians wrote, the English had not penetrated into the Eastern seas and there is no mention of them in the contemporary Portuguese histories. But during the later period the Portuguese documents are full of allusions to the English merchant adventurers. A new and valuable light is thrown from a fresh point of view from the growth of the English Empire in India. It has been too much the fashion to study the early history of the East India Company from English records alone. If the truth of that marvellous story is ever to be ascertained care must be taken to search not only Portuguese records but those of France and Holland and of the other European nations which had establishments in India. There is no space in this review to particularise the new lights afforded by the Report of Mr. Danvers. Real students must peruse it for themselves and they will find much that is both novel and startling in its contents. An attempt only has been made to point out the peculiar value of the Report by laying weight on its most salient features. The decline and fall of the Portuguese power in the East is a subject worthy of a Gibbon, and when a competent writer arises he will be the first to express his obligations to Mr. Danvers for his diligence and ability and to the India Office for its permission given to him to undertake this most useful and important work.

While it is absolutely necessary for anyone who desires to attain a correct knowledge of the history of the Europeans in India to study Mr. Danvers' Report, they cannot be too earnestly entreated to neglect Mr. D'Orsey's book. It is difficult to understand why he wrote it. It certainly was not wanted by anyone, and fills no possible gap. As far as any motive is to be perceived, it seems to have been dictated by an unreasoning hatred for the Jesuits and their methods of proselytism. Incidentally it seems to have been suggested by an interest in the Assyrian Church in India. But these subjects have been infinitely better treated by other writers. Professor Milne Rae has but recently published a most admirable book on the Assyrian Christians which Mr. D'Orsey has apparently never heard of. His authorities throughout are of the most antiquated description, and it is quite certain from an admission he makes that the book was written more than twenty years ago. For on page 347 he alludes to the well-known work of Edavalikel Philipos which was published in 1869 as having been written two years ago. Mr. D'Orsey must have a very poor opinion of English critics if he thinks so lightly of their sagacity as to try to palm off on the English reading public a volume which he has evidently had by him for a very long time and which he has not even had the energy to revise. The book would not have been a bad one if it had been issued in 1871, for the author seems to have read the printed material published before that date. But he should have had the candour to confess in his preface that it was a belated volume instead of leaving the critics to find it out. As it is Mr. D'Orsey's volume is both out of date and misleading, and the serious student may be strongly advised to neglect it. Its animus may possibly suit the rabid Protestants but will certainly disgust all moderate people.

It is with pleasure that all readers of Mr. Danvers' Report on the Portuguese Records will hear that the Secretary of State for India has given him permission to compile a similar Report on the Dutch Records. He has proved the soundness of his method and his new investigations may be expected to be as valuable as the Report under review. The India Office is not generally credited with a desire to promote the study of modern history, though it has always shown great liberality to students and scholars in the ancient languages of India. The work of Mr. Danvers ought to encourage them to do more in the same direction. Would that they would send a trained expert to calendar the Portuguese records relating to India as Mr. Rawdon Brown calendared those relating to England at Venice. The Record Office has not the means to set on foot another foreign agency, and as the Portuguese documents are more valuable in the light they throw

upon England than on English history this work might well be undertaken by the India Office. Mr. Danvers has shown the wealth of unknown material which lies hidden in Portugal. The India Office might well go a step further and have that wealth more thoroughly examined. In conclusion the India Office and Mr. Danvers are both to be congratulated on their recently-published Report, while Messrs. W. H. Allen and Co., whose name has appeared on the title page of so many standard works on Indian history, are to be commiserated for having allowed Mr. D'Orsey's volume to appear among their usually valuable publications.

THE CASE OF MR. M. M. MURZBAN.

A CORRESPONDENT writes: In your last month's issue you briefly mentioned the facts of Mr. M. M. Murzban's case. I happen to be in possession of details in regard to the case of Mr. T. G. Pudan, a brother-officer of Mr. Murzban. Over three years ago the powers that be in India telegraphed to the India Office authorities that Mr. Pudan (then on leave in England) was "on no account to be allowed to return to India," as "there was no vacancy to which Mr. Pudan could be posted" on his return to duty. Mr. Pudan was soon after served with notice of discharge, and although he was a pensionable officer of several years' service, there was considerable difficulty in his obtaining even the proportionate pension due to him. A lengthy correspondence ensued, and a pension was ultimately granted. Not satisfied with this "generosity," Mr. Pudan (though time-barred for an action in court) instituted an action at law for £30,000 damages. Two days before the case was to be called for hearing the India Office made overtures (of course, not in writing) to Mr. Pudan, and agreed to have the case withdrawn on payment of £1,500 and full costs of the case, without prejudice to further claims of Mr. Pudan to an increased pension. So far so good. I now approach the parallel between Mr. Pudan's case and Mr. Murzban's. Mr. Pudan is a European. Mr. Murzban is not. Mr. Pudan, in spite of being "time-barred," brought his action. Mr. Murzban could not take such a step, for the reason that, whereas Mr. Pudan was a pensionable officer, Mr. Murzban was not. The India Office was conscious of this weak point in Mr. Murzban's case, and appears to have taken ungenerous advantage of it.

LORD KIMBERLEY ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

AT the Guildhall Banquet, held on November 9th, Lord Kimberley said, in the course of his speech responding to the toast of "Her Majesty's Ministers:"—While speaking of foreign affairs, I am reminded that there are some in which I am more intimately concerned, and in which I have a share in common with my noble friend Lord Rosebery. I speak of our relations with Powers in Asia; and it is a great pleasure to me to be able to tell this audience that the most recent intelligence which I have received from the Viceroy of India is that the Mission of Sir Mortimer Durand to the Amir of Cabul has met with conspicuous success. (Cheers.) . . . . My friend Lord Lansdowne will have deserved high honour if he leaves our relations with Afghanistan upon a still better footing than formerly; and he deserves great credit for the manner in which he has introduced the most important change which has been made of late in India—I mean the introduction of some kind of representative element into the Indian Councils. The Viceroy has taken the greatest interest in that great change, and to him will be due the successful starting of it. There is also a dark side of the picture, and it is sufficient for me to mention here, as I did last year, the word silver in order to indicate it. Silver is our great difficulty in India; and you will appreciate the significance of this fact—that if at the present moment the old system prevailed and our exchange with India was regulated by the price of silver, the rupee would have fallen to nearly 1s. I ask, what would have been the condition of the finances of India, and what would have been our position as a Government, if we had not counteracted that effect? (Hear, hear.) I am not sure that our measures will be successful, but they were necessary and indispensable. There have also occurred in India some terrible riots between Muhammadans and Hindus, and I allude to them for the purpose of saying that the Government of the Empress of India is absolutely impartial. We have but one desire—to maintain order and peace without any favour to any denomination or religion in that country.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARTICLES IN MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY MAGAZINES ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

(*Extracted from the* "REVIEW OF REVIEWS,") WITH ADDITIONS.

DECEMBER, 1893.

CALCUTTA REVIEW (Kegan Paul). Barrow, F. H., "The Census and the Decline of Bengal"; Bose, P. N., "Hindu Civilisation under the Moslem Rule."

CHURCH MISSIONARY INTELLIGENCER (16, Salisbury Square). Ensor, Rev. G., "Missions or Science, the Maker of India's Homes?"

CORNHILL MAGAZINE (15, Waterloo Place). "The Subaltern in India a Hundred Years Ago."

INDIAN MAGAZINE AND REVIEW (14, Parliament Street). Jardine, Justice, "Literature in Burmah."

JOURNAL OF POLITICAL ECONOMY (University Press of Chicago). Laughlin, J. L., "Indian Monetary History."

MONTHLY PACKET (A. D. Innes, Bedford Street). Yonge, C. M., "The Black Hole of Calcutta."

NATIONAL REVIEW (W. H. Allen). James, H. E. M., "Reflections on the Way Home from India."

NINETEENTH CENTURY (Sampson Low). Sing, Hon. Odaz Pertap, Rájá of Bhinga, "'Russud': An Indian Grievance."

WESTMINSTER REVIEW (6, Bouverie Street). Roy, Parbati C., "The Alleged Danger of the Indian Civil Service 'Resolution'."

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS ON INDIAN SUBJECTS.

(*Extracted from the* "PUBLISHERS' CIRCULAR.")

DECEMBER, 1893.

CUMING, E. D. . . . . . "In the Shadow of the Pagoda: Sketches of Burmese Life and Character." (London: W. H. Allen and Co.) . . . . – –

BOWING, Louis B., C.S.I. . . . . "Haidar Ali and Tipu Sultan, and the Struggle with the Musalman Powers in the South." (Henry Frowde.) . . . . 2s. 6d.

Printed by A. BONNER, 34 Bouverie Street, Fleet Street, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors (the Indian National Congress), at 84 and 85 Palace Chambers, London, S.W.

INDIA.

EDITED BY GORDON HEWART, B.A.
FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.] [OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, LONDON, S.W.

VOL. IV. Supplement No. 9. DECEMBER, 1893.

This Supplement consists of a VERBATIM Report, specially drawn up for "India," of the Debates on Indian subjects in both Houses of Parliament, and questions put on such subjects and the answers given to them, arranged chronologically, from November 3rd to 23rd.

Imperial Parliament.

November 3rd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SIR M. DURAND'S MISSION.

Mr. SEYMOUR KEAY asked the Under Secretary of State for India whether Her Majesty's Government was in a position to give any information to the House as to the general object of Sir Mortimer Durand's present Mission to the Amir of Afghanistan:

And, if specific information could not be given, would Her Majesty's Government convey an assurance to the House that the existing engagements of the Government of India would not be enlarged in the direction of guaranteeing the integrity of the north-west frontier of Afghanistan.

Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL: The time has not come when information on the subject of the negotiations pending with the Amir of Afghanistan can properly be made public. But I may add that the Amir has received Sir M. Durand with much cordiality.

November 6th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE AFGHAN FRONTIER.

Mr. SEYMOUR KEAY asked the Under Secretary of State for India, whether Her Majesty's Government had any intention of allowing the Government of India to commit themselves or this country to increased obligations for the military defence of the Afghan frontier without first communicating such intention to Parliament.

Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL: No such question is under discussion at the present time, and Her Majesty's Government cannot give an answer as to a case which has not arisen.

November 7th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

IMMORAL TRAFFIC AT CALCUTTA.

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH asked the Under Secretary of State for India, whether his attention had been called to the exposure of a system of trafficking in young girls at Calcutta for immoral purposes:

Whether his attention had been specially drawn to the trial of one of those cases before Justice Pigot, at which it was proved that a girl, whose age was variously reckoned from to 11 years, was offered for sale for an immoral purpose:

Whether he was aware that, by the Indian Criminal Code, it was decreed that the sale of a minor "for any unlawful or immoral purpose" was a punishable offence, but that it was decided by Justice Pigot that this case did not come under the provisions of the Code, because "the commission of one immoral act is not contemplated under this section:"

And, whether the Government would lend the necessary facilities to have the decision reviewed by the Court of Appeal.

Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL: As soon as my hon. friend sent me the article in the *Sentinel* on the subject of the matters referred to in the question, and the report of Mr. Justice Pigot's construction of section 372 of the Indian Penal Code therein contained, I called the attention of the Secretary of State to the matter. In the absence of accurate information as to the facts of the case, and as to the grounds on which Mr. Justice Pigot's judgment may have been based, it is impossible for the Secretary of State to form any opinion on the matter. Under the law of India there is no appeal against acquittal or conviction by the High Court: but the attention of the Viceroy was called to the case last month, and we await his reply.

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH said: I should like to know in reference to that answer, whether my right hon. friend is aware that the consequence of this decision will be to paralyse the law and render convictions in these cases impossible?

Mr. SNAPE: I should like to ask whether when information is obtained from the Indian Government, the right hon. gentleman will lay it before the House?

Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL: I have already said that I will communicate it to my hon. friend when I receive it; and I think there will be no difficulty in laying it before the House.

INDIAN CANTONMENTS.

Mr. STANSFELD asked the Under Secretary of State for India whether any and what communications had passed between Her Majesty's Government and the Government of India upon the subject of the Report of the India Office Committee on the rules and practices in Indian cantonments regarding prostitution.

Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL: In reply to my right hon. friend I will read the telegram sent to the Government of India and their reply: "29th September. Your telegram, 14th, Cantonments. Report of Committee sent by mail of 15th September. Majority, including Under-Secretary, recommend legislation as only effective method of preventing practices inconsistent with Resolution of House of Commons. In this view I am disposed to concur, but proposal requires careful examination, and I request that you will take Report into your immediate consideration, and telegraph to me before House of Commons reassemble in November what measures you are prepared to adopt. You will doubtless call to account all officers concerned who are proved to have allowed practices inconsistent with the Resolution above referred to in contravention of your orders." Reply of Government of India: "31st October, 1893. Your telegram, 29th September, Cantonments. We are sending by this mail drafts of three Bills and of Regulations to show how effect might be given to intentions of majority report, as we understand them. We think your lordship should see our

despatch and these drafts before deciding whether legislation is indispensable, or what form it might take. Officers concerned have been called to account, and we shall inform your lordship of result." I will lay these two telegrams on the Table, and also a circular issued by the Quarter-Master General, which has been recently received from the Government of India.

BEHAR CADASTRAL SURVEY.

Mr. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN asked the Under Secretary of State for India whether the results of the experimental surveys in Behar had induced the Government of Bengal to alter their estimate of eight annas per acre for the total cost of the Behar Cadastral Survey:

Whether the cost of the Srinagar-Banaili Survey was nearly eleven annas per acre:

And whether the results of the survey of the Shrinagar-Banaili estate could be laid before Parliament, showing the average size of the holdings as compared with the average size of those in North Behar; the amount of forest and waste land as compared with that in North Behar; the number of petitions filed against the entries made by the Amins; the number of civil suits filed, including fair rent suits and boundary disputes; the number of cases carried to an appellate court; the number of cases in which the decision of the settlement officer had been reversed or modified by that litigation; and the estimated total cost of the litigation resulting from the survey of the Shrinagar-Banaili estate?

Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL: No information has reached the Secretary of State to show that the cost of the cadastral survey of North Behar will, on the average, exceed eight annas an acre. According to the latest reports the cost of survey on the Shrinagar estate was $4\frac{2}{3}$ annas per acre, and the cost of settlement was $5\frac{3}{8}$ annas per acre. The Secretary of State has not the information necessary for the preparation of the return asked for. But I shall be glad to place at the hon. member's disposal the Bengal Land Records and Court of Wards reports for the two years 1890-91 and 1891-92. I will also, if the hon. member will move for them, lay on the Table copies of further correspondence on the Behar Survey in continuation of the papers laid last year.

November 9th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SIMULTANEOUS EXAMINATIONS: PETITIONS.

Mr. PAUL asked the Chairman of the Committee on Public Petitions how many petitions had been presented from India during the present Session in favour of holding simultaneous examinations for the Indian Civil Service, and how many against them:

What was the total number of signatures on either side:

And how many petitions were signed by chairmen of public meetings on behalf of the meetings?

Sir C. DALRYMPLE, Chairman of the Committee on Public Petitions, said the total number of petitions presented in favour of holding simultaneous examinatians for the Indian Civil Service was 44, containing 20,232 signatures. The number against was one, containing one signature—that of a chairman of a public meeting. The number of petitions signed by chairmen of public meetings in favour is 17.

JUSTICE IN INDIA.

Mr. WEBB asked the Under Secretary of State for India whether inquiry had yet been made into a case referred to in INDIA for August, wherein it was stated that a Private John Rugby had kicked a punkah coolie to death, and been let off with a fine of Rs. 100:

And whether he was aware that, as stated in the same paper, a judge, in trying a white man for outraging a Rajput woman, admitted charging the jury with a strong bias in favour of the accused?

Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL: The Secretary of State has received information that, the punkah coolie having fallen asleep at his post, Private Rugby jumped out of bed and gave him one or more blows on the body. The medical evidence showed that the cause of death was rupture of the spleen, which was in such a state that the slightest blow might have broken it, and there were no external marks of violence. In these circumstances the magistrate convicted Private Rugby of voluntarily causing hurt, and sentenced him to pay a fine of Rs. 100, or in default to three week's rigorous imprisonment. The fine was paid, and awarded as compensation to the relatives of the deceased. With regard to the second question, I must refer my honourable friend to the answer which I gave on the 14th August last, viz., that the Secretary of State is informed that there is no ground on which the decision of the Court can be questioned.

MR. MONRO'S APPOINTMENT.

Mr. BARTON asked the Under Secretary of State for India whether Dr. John Bradshaw had been superseded in the appointment of Acting Director of Public Instruction in the Presidency of Madras and Mr. Monro appointed in his place, although Dr. Bradshaw had been over twenty-two and a-half years in the educational service of the Madras Government, and was senior officer qualified for the post, and Mr. Monro was junior to Dr. Bradshaw by nine years:

And whether any reply had been sent by the Department to the Memorial of Dr. Bradshaw praying that the appointment might be conferred on him?

Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL: It is true that the Government of Madras, with whom the appointment rests, have selected Mr. Monro, and that Dr. Bradshaw has sent in a memorial on the subject, which is now under the consideration of the Secretary of State in Council.

RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION IN INDIA.

Sir JAMES KITSON asked the Under Secretary of State for India if the Indian Government had modified the conditions under which concessions were given to companies seeking to construct railways in India; if so, would he state what were the conditions under which railways might be constructed by private enterprise in India and Burma, with the object of promoting the extension of the railway system and thereby the development of trade and commerce in India and in Great Britain?

Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL: Yes, sir. A resolution on the subject has recently been issued by the Government of India, which the Secretary of State will be glad to lay on the Table if my hon. friend will move for it.

November 13th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SIR C. CROSTHWAITE'S CIRCULAR.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Under Secretary of State for India, whether the attention of the Secretary of State for India had been drawn to a circular dated 15th September last, issued by the Government of the North West Provinces, urging magistrates to exercise greater stringency in their procedure and punishments, especially in the matter of whipping, and advising that whipping should ordinarily be awarded in cases of theft, unless the offender was an old or weakly man, and that male juvenile offenders should as a rule be punished by whipping, by prolonged detention in a reformatory, or in exceptional cases by a long term of imprisonment:

And, whether the Secretary of State would direct these instructions to be withdrawn or modified.

Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL: The Secretary of State had not seen a copy of the circular referred to, which is not of such a kind as to require his previous sanction, until after my honourable friend's question had appeared on the paper. In the absence of any explanation from the local Government or the Government of India, he is unable to pronounce an opinion; but he has telegraphed to India and will be prepared to state the result in due course.

THE HINDU-MUHAMMADAN RIOTS.

Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN asked the Under Secretary of State for India, whether the attention of the Secretary of State for India had been drawn to the remarks of the session judge of Ghazipur upon the proceedings of Mr. Bird, the District Magistrate of Ballia, in the case of Hanuman Tewari

and others, sentenced to three months rigorous imprisonment in connection with the Hindu-Muhammadan riots;

Whether he was aware that the session judge, referring to a portion of the district magistrate's judgment, said that such language was deplorable and could not fail to add to the ill-feeling among the people, and recommended the conviction and sentence to be set aside for want of jurisdiction and because the accused did not have an impartial trial and were convicted on totally insufficient evidence:

Whether notice would be taken of the district magistrate's conduct:

And, whether his attention had been drawn to the allegations in the Indian press, that certain Hindu officials under the Government of the North West Provinces had been punished or called to account for having subscribed to or supported the Cow Protection Society; if so, whether such action was sanctioned by the Secretary of State.

Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL; The Secretary of State has seen a copy of the orders issued by the sessions judge, before whom an appeal was brought in an ordinary course. The facts are as stated. The accused were released on their own recognizances pending the final orders of the High Court. These orders will doubtless guide the Lieutenant-Governor as to the action to be taken. The Secretary of State has seen the statements referred to. He is expecting further papers from the Government of India about the cow-killing riots and the questions arising therefrom, and will ask for a report on the subject of these allegations.

November 14th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SIMULTANEOUS EXAMINATION.

Petitions were presented in favour of Simultaneous Examinations for the Indian Civil Service from the inhabitants of Nipani, District Belgaum, Bombay Presidency, in public meeting assembled, and the inhabitants of Nipani, District Belgaum, Bombay Presidency, by Sir W. Wedderburn, Bart.; the inhabitants of Taluka, Targaon, District Satara, Presidency of Bombay; the inhabitants of Sangli, a native state in the Southern Mahratta Country, Bombay Presidency, and the inhabitants Hukeri, District Belgaum, Bombay Presidency, by Mr. C. E. Schwann; the inhabitants of the City of Dhulia, Khandesh District, Presidency of Bombay, in public meeting assembled, the inhabitants of the City and Suburbs of Dharwar, District Dharwar, Bombay Presidency, the inhabitants of Kasegam, Taluka Wolva Zilla Satara, and the inhabitants of Gokarn, District North Kanara, Bombay Presidency, by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji.

THE BEHAR CADASTRAL SURVEY.

Mr. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN asked the Under Secretary of State for India whether the proposals of the Government of Bengal to provide for the annual revision of the Record-of-Rights of the Behar Cadastral Survey had yet been submitted to the Secretary of State for India; and whether the Secretary of State would withhold his sanction from the Record-of-Rights Bill until he had had an opportunity of receiving his memorials against it that had been prepared and were now being signed in Behar.

Mr. S. BUXTON: 1. No, sir; the proposals of the Government of India have not been received by the Secretary of State; 2. The Secretary of State will wait a reasonable time for the receipt of the memorials before he comes to a decision.

HOOK-SWINGING FESTIVALS.

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH asked the Under Secretary of State for India, whether his attention had been drawn to the existence of a hook-swinging festival at a village only 17 miles from Calcutta, at which it was stated that the hooks had been passed into about two and a-half inches of the skin and flesh of the man's back:

And, whether the Government of India would be urged to put an end to the annual recurrence of these festivals.

Sir E. GREY: Yes, sir; it had previously been brought to the notice of the Secretary of State by the Government of India in June in reply to a despatch asking them, with reference to recent cases in Madras, to consider how the practice of hook-swinging might best be finally extinguished. The Secretary of State has not yet received the proposals of the Government of India. I shall be glad to show my honourable friend the papers that have been received.

Mr. CAINE asked the Under Secretary of State for India, if the attention of the Secretary of State had been drawn to the recent increase of hook swinging festivals in India, to their condemnation by the leaders of Brahmanism, and their reprobation by the native press:

If it was true that surgeons in the employ of the Indian Government frequently superintended these hook-swinging festivals with a view to testing the physical capacity of the persons swung to bear the torture inflicted upon them:

And, if the Indian Government would be instructed to suppress them in future as a public nuisance.

Sir E. GREY: As stated in my answer to my honourable friend the member for Flintshire, the subject is receiving the consideration of the Government of India. It appears that in the Madura case, about which my honourable friend asked a question in February last, a surgeon was present with the object of seeing whether there was evidence to justify the magistrate in prohibiting the performance as dangerous to life, health or safety. But it was found impossible to take action on this ground; and, so far as the Secretary of State is aware, no other similar festival has been attended by surgeons in the employment of Government. The Secretary of State is advised that under the present Criminal Procedure Code, it is impossible to proceed in the manner suggested.

November 17th.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE MADRAS AND BOMBAY ARMIES BILL.

On the consideration of the Commons' Amendments to this Bill,

The EARL OF KIMBERLEY: Your lordships will remember that in the summer this measure to amend the law relating to the Madras and Bombay Armies passed this House. The matter which I have now to mention to you merely relates to one single portion of the Bill. In this House an amendment was moved by Lord Cross, who was fortified in his action by several peers of experience in Indian affairs, that those who command the Madras and Bombay armies were to remain members of the Council of the two Presidencies. At the time that the discussion took place, I said in the House that after so strong an expression of opinion from so many noble lords, I did not think it necessary to divide the House on the question, but I reserved to myself the right to take action on any future stage of the Bill. The measure went down to the other House and it was stated there on behalf of the Government that in the circumstances and looking at the period of the Session they would be willing to allow the Bill to pass, and become law as it stood. That, however, was by no means accepted by the House generally, and an amendment was moved which received considerable support to restore the Bill to its original condition, under which the Commanders of the two armies ceased to be members of the Council. The amendment was adopted and the section now runs, "The officers holding at the commencement of this Act the offices of Commander-in-Chief of the forces in the Presidencies of Madras and Bombay shall cease to be members of the Council of the Governors of Madras and Bombay respectively." The other words to the end of the section have been left out. I feel somewhat bound after there has been so strong an expression of opinion in this House, although I do not share that opinion, to point out that there was a strong feeling in the other House against the acceptance of Lord Cross's amendment, and that it was not done merely on the motion of the Government without discussion. In taking the Commons' amendment into consideration, I wish to express a strong hope that this House will not insist upon their amendment. Since our discussion here a despatch has come from the Government of India, who had previously stated that they saw no objection to the Commanders of the two armies remaining on the Council, that they now upon full consideration of the whole matter had arrived at a very decided opinion that it was not necessary or desirable. They go very fully into the reasons which have forced them to

come to that conclusion. That despatch was laid upon the table in both Houses. I must say I should deeply regret it if a Bill of this great importance in which matters are dealt with which have been brought forward again and again by successive Governments of India, should now at the last moment fail in passing. I have no doubt whatever that the noble lords who proposed the amendment adhere to their opinion, that it was desirable that the commanders should remain in the Bombay and Madras Councils, but I venture to think that they will not press the view they take to the point of endangering a Bill of such magnitude. I think if the amendment were insisted upon the measure might be so endangered, and I desire earnestly to impress upon this House how necessary it is that they should agree to the Commons' amendment.

The Marquis of SALISBURY: I am sorry my noble friend Lord Cross has been unavoidably prevented from attending this discussion, as no doubt he would have been glad to give his opinion upon the subject. I have however had the advantage of conferring with the noble viscount and others, including Lord Roberts, who is obliged to be at Edinburgh to-day, but whose opinion will have very great weight with your lordships. As far as I am able to ascertain the general opinion even among those who supported the amendment here last summer, it is that however much there is to be said for the amendment its value is not such as to justify them in risking a Bill which is of extreme importance—(hear, hear)—and although I regret very much that the House of Commons have taken the view they have done I do not think it will be reasonable for us to insist upon the amendment. I fear, however, that the proposal of the House of Commons will in the end be a condemnation of separate Presidencies in India, and that if Councils are handed over to an absolute majorities of civil servants the system will not be found to work smoothly. There will, I think, be a tendency towards concentration and centralisation, which will tend in drawing the Presidencies of Bombay and Madras under the more immediate Government of India. However, that may be, the Indian authorities are in favour of the Bill passing as it is now and Lord Roberts is also of that opinion, and therefore I think we should not insist upon our view of what after all is a matter of detail. For about fifteen or twenty years we had longed for the change in the relations of the two armies which the Bill will introduce, and it will be very unfortunate if the opportunity of passing it should be thrown away.

The Earl of KIMBERLEY: I have also received a letter from Lord Roberts strongly expressing the opinion that it was not desirable the amendment should be pressed and also of great importance to pass the Bill. I was very glad to hear the words of the noble marquis.

The Commons' amendments were then agreed to.

November 17th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE BEHAR CADASTRAL SURVEY.

SIR RICHARD TEMPLE asked the Under Secretary of State for India whether he was aware that the Bengal Government for some nineteen years during the minority of the Mahárájá of Darbhangah, Sir Lachmeshivar Singh, managed his estate:

Whether a complete survey and settlement and record of rights of his property in Behar was commenced and all but completed by a Bengal Government settlement officer, and completed by the Mahárájá at a cost of some lacs of rupees:

And whether, this being the case, the Bengal Government now contemplated resurveying this property, and thereby putting the Mahárájá to further great and needless expense, and probably involving him in much litigation; and, if so, whether the Secretary of State would take necessary steps to stop such action on the part of the Bengal Government, if not entirely at least till such time as inquiry could be made and the Mahárájá's objections be heard?

MR. GEORGE RUSSELL: A survey of the greater part of the Darbhangah estates was completed; but there is a doubt whether the record of rights suffices to safeguard the interests of the rayats under the Bengal Tenancy Act. Complete information on the subject has not yet reached the Secretary of State, but it is understood that the surveys and record of rights, previously effected on the Darbhangah and other estates, will be utilised for the present cadastral survey of North Behar, so that the duration and cost of the operations may be diminished as far as possible.

EVENTS AT HAIDERABAD.

MR. SEYMOUR KEAY asked the Under Secretary of State for India whether he was aware that a person named Surwar Jung had, under the support of the British Resident, succeeded in obtaining for himself all the real power in the Haiderabad State:

Whether he was aware that the Resident was charged with having prejudiced the course of justice in Haiderabad by publicly favouring Surwur Jung, one of the parties to an important suit tried for nine months before his own Court; and that Surwur Jung extorted a bribe of Rs. 100,000 from the Prime Minister of Haiderabad by threats:

Whether the Minister's chief advisers had been banished, one of them at least, on the Resident's express recommendation, while Surwar Jung, the recipient of the bribe, had been exonerated from all blame:

Whether he was aware that the Resident had endeavoured to procure the dismissal of the Minister as well as of his advisers:

And, whether Her Majesty's Government would represent to the Government of India the necesssity of a reversal of the policy whereby the present deadlock had been produced in the Haiderabad State.

MR. GEORGE RUSSELL: The Secretary of State is in correspondence with the Government of India regarding the events at Haiderabad to which the hon. member's questions allude. Such papers as he had already received from the Government of India show that the view taken by that Government of the transactions referred to, differs considerably from the conclusions indicated in the hon. member's questions, but pending the receipt of a further report promised by the Government of India, the Secretary of State must withhold his answer to the questions.

November 20th.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE BOTANIC GARDENS, CALCUTTA.

MR. CAINE asked the Under Secretary of State for India what quantity of cinchona, in the bulk of all preparations, had been sold by the Superintendent of the Botanic Gardens, Calcutta, each year from 1886 to 1892:

And, what had been the average price for the year.

MR. GEO. RUSSELL: I shall be glad to hand my honourable friend a detailed statement for the seven years. In 1892-3, 5,520 lbs. of quinine and 3,650 lbs. of cinchona febrifuge were sold from the factory near Darjeeling to the medical department and to the public at a price of one rupee an ounce for quinine, and ten annas an ounce for cinchona febrifuge.

THE ANTWERP EXHIBITION.

MR. CAINE asked the Under Secretary of State for India what steps had been taken by the Government of India to promote exhibits of Indian produce and manufacture at the Antwerp International Exhibition of 1894.

MR. GEO. RUSSELL: The promoters of the Antwerp Exhibition are in direct communication with the Government of India, and that Government have advertised the fact that the Exhibition is going to be held. The Secretary of State has not heard that any assistance has been asked for by intending exhibitors in India.

November 23rd.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

A DISMISSED REVENUE OFFICER.

MR. ALPHEUS MORTON asked the Under Secretary of State for India whether he was aware of the fact that the discretionary power that lay in the Bombay Government to forward petitions addressed to the Secretary of State for India in Council was exercised in 1890 in the case of the memorial of Mr. Gopal Bapji Khade, a dismissed Revenue officer, who was

in receipt of a monthly salary of Rs. 60 only, and was refused to be exercised in December, 1892, and July, 1893, in the case of the memorial of Mr. N. D. Kalvade, a Mamlutdar in the receipt of a monthly salary of Rs. 250.

And, whether, under the circumstance that Mr. N. D. Kalvade complained of never having had an impartial inquiry into his case, the Secretary of State for India would intimate to the Bombay Government his desire that that Government would, as a special case, consent to forward to the Home Government the memorial of Mr. N. D. Kalvade, together with the opinions of each member of the Bombay Council recorded thereon.

Mr. Geo. Russell: The Memorial of Mr. Khade was received by the Government of Bombay before the publication of the Orders of October, 1889, which empowered them to withhold such Memorials in the exercise of their discretion. It was therefore held not to come within the scope of those Orders. For the reasons given by me in answer to questions on the subject on the 6th April, and 17th July last, the Secretary of State must decline to make any exception to the Rules in favour of Mr. Kalvade.

SHOOTING A RAILWAY GATEKEEPER.

Mr. Caine asked the Under-Secretary of State for India, whether the attention of the Secretary of State had been called to the circumstances attendant upon the death of Hampana, a Hindu railway gatekeeper at Guntakal, Madras Railway, who was shot by one of a party of soldiers belonging to the details of the 2nd Welsh Regiment proceeding from Wellington to Secunderabad, and who died within twenty-three hours after being shot.

Whether he was aware that Hampana was shot while protecting two Hindu women from the violence of the soldiers, the women having fled to his hut for safety; that the only means of identification offered to the dying man was the passing of 120 fully-accoutred soldiers past him at eight o'clock at night on a dimly-lighted platform; that when a search was made for the revolver with which the shot was fired the bedding and the persons of the soldiers were omitted in the search; and that the officer in command proceeded to Secunderabad with his detachment within a few hours of the shot being fired, and without giving the wounded man the opportunity of identifying during daylight the man who fired the shot:

And, whether the Secretary of State would obtain and lay all Papers connected with this matter upon the Table of this House.

Mr. George Russell: The Government of Madras will be called on for a report on the case. The Secretary of State has reason to believe that Government has offered a reward of 1,000 Rs. for such evidence as may lead to the detection of the offenders.

Mr. Caine asked: Has no notice been taken of the conduct of the officer in command.

Mr. George Russell: Until we have information from the Government of India as to what actually occurred I can say nothing further.

THE BEHAR CADASTRAL SURVEY.

Mr. Seton-Karr asked the Under Secretary of State for India, whether the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, in his letter of 6th July last to the Government of India on the Behar Cadastral Survey, declared that one of the results of the Survey would be to enhance the rents of the landlords to an extent varying from 12 to 15 per cent., and admitted that the tenants would probably suffer from the enhancement of their rents:

Whether the Lieutenant-Governor now states, in a recently published minute, that the main object of the Survey and Record-of-Rights was to protect the tenants from the improper enhancement of their rents by the landlords:

And, whether the Secretary of State could state the grounds (if any) on which these two statements could be reconciled.

Mr. Geo. Russell: The Government of Bengal never stated that the survey would "enhance the rents of the landlord to an extent varying from 12 to 15 per cent." The statement in the letter referred to was to the effect that the experience acquired in the settlements already executed under the Act showed that on the average the Zemindars might count on realizing a return of from 12 to 15 per cent.—not on their total rental—but on the cost to them of the Settlement operations. This would be effected partly by the greater ease with which rents would be recovered, and also by the direct gain in cases where the tenants were found to be holding more land than they were paying for. The statement in the letter of 6th June, is thus not inconsistent with Sir A. MacDonnell's Minute which is included in the Return lately laid on the Table.